

Also, a bill (H. R. 11771) for the relief of Nathan Mathews; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLACK of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 11772) for the relief of Edward Dubied & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 11773) granting an increase of pension to Anna Guild; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON: A bill (H. R. 11774) granting an increase of pension to Deborah Weller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESTERLY: A bill (H. R. 11775) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Rowland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11776) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. Hassler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11777) granting an increase of pension to Agnes F. Gibson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11778) granting an increase of pension to Emma Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 11779) authorizing the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render final judgment in the claim of Thomas M. Rose; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLAHERTY: A bill (H. R. 11780) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 11781) granting an increase of pension to John L. Mateer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 11782) for the relief of William B. Warder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 11783) granting an increase of pension to Anna Maria Buhler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11784) granting an increase of pension to Olive A. Torbet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11785) granting an increase of pension to Hattie Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11786) for the relief of William Henry Judson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 11787) for the relief of Morris Pondfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 11788) granting an increase of pension to Christina N. Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 11789) for the relief of Lewis Brooks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 11790) granting an increase of pension to Lillie C. Ray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 11791) granting a pension to Ida M. Schotte; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 11792) granting an increase of pension to Cynthia M. Byron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RATHBONE: A bill (H. R. 11793) granting a pension to Edward Tilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 11794) granting an increase of pension to Euphema Beasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11795) granting an increase of pension to Lorinda Wester; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11796) granting an increase of pension to Minerva L. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STROTHER: A bill (H. R. 11797) granting a pension to Anna M. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWARTZ: A bill (H. R. 11798) granting a pension to Minnie S. Cadiz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11799) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Draper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11800) granting a pension to Charles H. Van Etten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11801) granting a pension to Charles Kuhle; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1998. By Mr. CAREW: Letters explaining bill introduced April 29, 1926, by Mr. CAREW to validate devises, bequests,

gifts, etc., by enemy aliens to American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1999. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Mr. S. Fred Cummings and others, urging support of the Federal farm board bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2000. By Mr. KNUTSON: Petition of William A. Patterson, Remer, Minn., and others, protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2001. By Mr. KVALE: Memorial of 77 Federal reserve bank members of the State of Minnesota, opposing any legalization of branch banking and urging amendments to promote smooth operation of the Federal reserve system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2002. Also, petition of the Farmer-Labor Association of Minnesota, in biennial convention assembled, urging enactment of adequate relief legislation at this session of Congress which will insure the farmer economic justice; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2003. Also, petition of members of A. B. Post No. 127, American Legion, Hanley Falls, Minn., unanimously urging enactment into law at this session of House bills 10240, 10277, 4548, 10358, and 10426; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2004. Also, petition of members of Sunnyside Farmers' Club, of Kandiyohi County, Minn., urging early construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence deep waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2005. By Mr. LUCE: Resolution of the Mendon Association of Congregational Churches, urging the effective enforcement of prohibition to strengthen the Volstead Act; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

2006. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Woodhaven Republican Association, of Woodhaven, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Stanfield-Lehlbach retirement bills; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2007. Also, petition of the Industrial Acceptance Corporation, of New York City, opposing the passage of Senate bill 3511; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2008. Also, petition of the A. I. Root Co., of Medina, Ohio, opposing the passage of House bill 39; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2009. By Mr. PERKINS: Memorial of the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War, numbering over 50,000 citizens, earnestly protesting against Confederate memorial upon Stone Mountain in Georgia and also protesting against pensioning of ex-Confederate soldiers by the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2010. By Mr. RANSLEY: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, opposing House bill 487, the creation in the District of Columbia of an insurance fund for the benefit of employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2011. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Hannibal Chamber of Commerce, of Hannibal, Mo., urging the passage of the Hawes bill (H. R. 8988); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, April 30, 1926

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 29, 1926)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frazier	McKinley	Shipstead
Bayard	Gillett	McLean	Shortridge
Bingham	Glass	McMaster	Simmons
Blease	Goff	McNary	Smith
Borah	Gooding	Mayfield	Smoot
Bratton	Greene	Means	Stanfield
Broussard	Hale	Metcalf	Steck
Bruce	Harrell	Norbeck	Stephens
Cameron	Harris	Norris	Swanson
Couzens	Harrison	Nye	Trammell
Cummins	Heflin	Oddie	Tyson
Curtis	Howell	Overman	Wadsworth
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Walsh
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Warren
Dill	Kendrick	Ransdell	Watson
Edge	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Weller
Edwards	King	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Fernald	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Williams
Ferris	Lenroot	Sackett	Willis
Fess	McKellar	Sheppard	

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CAPPER] is absent on account of illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GILLET. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent to-day on important business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ADDITIONAL WING TO DISTRICT JAIL

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, on yesterday on the call of the calendar the Senate passed the bill (H. R. 10204) providing an additional wing to the District Jail. The commissioners have suggested a very desirable amendment, and I desire to enter a motion to reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed. If the bill has gone to the House, I ask unanimous consent that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington subsequently said: Mr. President, I find that the bill to which I referred a moment ago, House bill 10204, has not gone to the House. Therefore I move that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is a bill providing an additional wing to the District Jail. The commissioners have suggested an amendment that should have been adopted before we passed the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The amendment was not presented to the Senate?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill, recommended by the commissioners.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct an additional building at the District Jail and to rearrange the interior construction of the east wing of the present jail building so as to provide accommodations for not less than 200 additional prisoners, at a total cost not exceeding \$300,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) for placing the statue of Crawford W. Long in Statuary Hall.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 957. An act for the purchase of the Oldroyd collection of Lincoln relics; and

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to authorize the American National Red Cross to continue the use of temporary buildings now erected on square No. 172 in Washington, D. C.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills:

H. R. 9494. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River on the Gainesboro-Red Boiling Springs road in Jackson County, Tenn.; and

H. R. 10002. An act granting the consent of Congress to H. J. Stannert, Harry Weis, and George W. Rockwell to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River from a point in the city of Sunbury, Northumberland County, to a point in the township of Monroe, in Snyder County, in the State of Pennsylvania.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

H. R. 7904. An act granting the consent of Congress to Des Arc Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the White River at Des Arc, Ark.;

H. R. 9348. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Weirton Bridge & Development Co. for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River near Steubenville, Ohio;

H. R. 9503. An act granting permission to the State Highway Commission of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Savannah, Hardin County, Tenn., on the Savannah-Selmer road;

H. R. 9506. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington road in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.; and

H. R. 9505. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Waverly-Camden Road between Humphreys and Benton Counties, Tenn.

The message further announced that the House had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3791. An act to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy in 1891 and entitled "Peace";

H. R. 3990. An act for the erection of a monument upon the Revolutionary battle field of White Plains, State of New York;

H. R. 5359. An act authorizing the purchase by the Secretary of Commerce of a site and the construction and equipment of a building thereon for use as a master track scale and test car depot, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6252. An act amending section 52 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 9511. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to remit or change deductions or fines imposed upon contractors for mail service;

H. R. 10202. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy; and

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversaries of the independence of Vermont and the Battle of Bennington, and authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 6772. An act to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Kingdom of Rumania to the United States of America;

H. R. 6777. An act to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Czechoslovak Republic to the United States of America;

H. R. 8908. An act granting the consent of Congress to George Washington-Wakefield Memorial Bridge, a corporation, to construct a bridge across the Potomac River;

H. R. 8918. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Louisiana, Mo.;

H. R. 8950. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota to construct a bridge across the Minnesota River at or near Shakopee, Minn.;

H. R. 9688. An act granting the consent of Congress to the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across Sandusky Bay at or near Bay Bridge, Ohio; and

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign governments to participate in the Seventh International Dental Congress, to be held at Philadelphia, Pa., August 23 to 28, 1926.

GEORGE ROGERS CLARK MEMORIAL LIGHTHOUSE

Mr. FERRIS presented resolutions adopted by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in Thirty-fifth Annual Congress assembled, at Washington, D. C., indorsing and approving the bill (H. R. 9644) to authorize the construction of a George Rogers Clark Memorial Lighthouse on the Ohio River at or adjacent to the city of Louisville, Ky., which were referred to the Committee on the Library.

FEDERAL BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post for May 1, 1926, entitled "No more monuments to mediocrity." It is a plea for architectural skill in the construction of buildings for the Federal Government.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post for May 1, 1926]

NO MORE MONUMENTS TO MEDIOCRITY

The new building program of the Federal Government will involve the expenditure of an appropriation of \$165,000,000. Nearly a third

of this sum will be employed in and about the city of Washington. This new work is bound to have a far-reaching effect upon the appearance of the city. The type of design established by earlier administrations has given our National Capital many beautiful and distinguished buildings. It seems clear that this type should be perpetuated in the projected work. Recent structures, such as the Lincoln Memorial, the Freer Gallery, the Treasury Annex, and the design for the Arlington Memorial Bridge, have added greatly to the distinction of the city; and in doing so they have placed upon the administrators of the current appropriation a weighty obligation to see that new public works maintain the quality of those already completed.

Those who are anxious to see this ideal carried out in terms of the greatest fitness and architectural beauty note with some apprehension the fact that the Supervising Architect's Office has desired the Civil Service Commission to hold examinations for some 200 additional architects and assistants.

The maximum salary offered is \$3,800.

The Supervising Architect appears to be making no effective bid for acknowledged professional eminence or for genius of a high order. No argument should be required to prove that this great and important undertaking should be parceled out among the ablest architects in the country, to the end that the National Government may secure results no less fine and distinguished than those which are being achieved from coast to coast for private interests in the way of railway stations, banking houses, and great office buildings. Nothing less should satisfy any of us whose native pride makes us desire to see Washington the most beautiful and impressive of all world capitals. The lofty standard to which the best American public architecture has attained makes such an ambition possible of realization; but if our dream is to come true it will be because we see to it that our new work reflects the genius of our age and Nation and not their mediocrity.

There are rules and precedents which might make it difficult, if not impossible, for those who will have the spending of the appropriation to avail themselves of the services of those outstanding architects, not in Government employ, who ought to be called upon to prepare plans and drawings for the new work and see that it is keyed into harmony with the old. It is highly important, therefore, that Congress, when making building appropriations, specifically authorize the employment of outside architectural talent, and that executives take advantage of this power to command the services of the most brilliant men in the profession.

Every ugly public building is a monument erected by some architect to his own lack of taste. It is a conspicuous and enduring memorandum of his own blunders, a chronic eyesore for generations of beholders, and a perennial bidder for contemptuous criticism. Neither parsimony nor politics, red tape, nor false economy should be allowed to menace our Capital City with such dour piles of frozen discord. We should not be satisfied even with respectable mediocrity. We ought to strive for a group of buildings conceived in the beauty, touched with the distinction, and informed with the inevitable rightness and authority which genius alone can create.

SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

Mr. KING. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. ERNST], chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I report a resolution, unanimously approved by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in the matter of the contest of Mr. Bursum against Senator Bratton, of New Mexico. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 215) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Sam G. Bratton is hereby declared to be a duly elected Senator of the United States from the State of New Mexico for the term of six years, commencing on the 4th day of March, 1925, and is entitled to be seated as such.

Mr. KING. I ask permission to file the report accompanying the resolution (Rept. No. 724).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. TYSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3878) to give war-time rank to certain officers on the retired list of the Army, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 720) thereon.

Mr. FRAZIER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8306) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the heroism of the fathers and mothers who traversed the Oregon Trail to the far West with great hardship, daring, and loss of life, which not only resulted in adding new States to the Union but earned a well-deserved and imperishable fame for the pioneers; to honor the 20,000 dead that lie buried in unknown graves along 2,000 miles of that great highway of history; to rescue the various important points along the old trail from oblivion; and to commemorate by suitable monuments, memorial or

otherwise, the tragic events associated with that emigration—erecting them either along the trail itself or elsewhere, in localities appropriate for the purpose, including the city of Washington, reported it without recommendation and submitted a report (No. 721) thereon.

Mr. STANFIELD, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 1050) for the relief of William F. Brockschmidt, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 722) thereon.

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8313) to allot living children on the Crow Reservation, Mont., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 723) thereon.

Mr. DILL, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3958) to provide for the permanent withdrawal of certain lands adjoining the Makah Indian Reservation in Washington for the use and occupancy of the Makah and Quileute Indians, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 725) thereon.

Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3749) to provide for the erection at Burns, Oreg., of a school for the use of the Plute Indian children, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 733) thereon.

PATENTS TO LANDS IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I report back favorably with an amendment from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys the bill (S. 4055) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for lands held under color of title, and I submit a report (No. 717) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was, at the end of the bill, after the word "corporation" and before the period, to insert "organized under the laws of the United States or any State or Territory thereof," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that a tract or tracts of public land, not known to be mineral, in the State of New Mexico, not exceeding in the aggregate 160 acres, has or have been held in good faith and in peaceful, adverse possession by a citizen of the United States, his ancestors or grantors, for more than 20 years under claim or color of title, and that valuable improvements have been placed on such land, or some part thereof has been reduced to cultivation, the Secretary may, in his discretion, upon the payment of \$1.25 per acre, cause a patent or patents to issue for such land to any such citizen: *Provided*, That where the area or areas so held by any such citizen is in excess of 160 acres the Secretary may determine what particular subdivisions, not exceeding 160 acres in the aggregate, to any such citizen may be patented hereunder: *Provided further*, That the term "citizen" as used herein shall be held to include a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or any State or Territory thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RED RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 5691) granting the consent of Congress to Charles L. Moss, A. E. Harris, and T. C. Shattuck, of Duncan, Okla., to construct a bridge across Red River at a point between the States of Texas and Oklahoma where the ninety-eighth meridian crosses said Red River, and I submit a report (No. 718) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRELD] to the bill.

Mr. HARRELD. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Let it be read.

The bill was read, and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, which were, in section 1, page 2, at the end of line 3, after the numerals "1906," to insert a comma and "and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act"; and to strike out sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 in the following words:

Sec. 2. That the said Charles L. Moss, A. E. Harris, and T. C. Shattuck, their heirs, administrators, and assigns, are hereby authorized and empowered to fix and charge just and reasonable tolls for the passage over such bridge of pedestrians, animals, and vehicles

adapted to travel on public highways, and the rates so fixed shall be the legal rates, and the Secretary of War shall prescribe other rates of toll as provided in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 3. That the States of Oklahoma and Texas, or any official agency of either thereof, or any political or other subdivision or subdivisions thereof within or adjoining which such bridge is located, may jointly or severally at any time after 15 years from the completion of such bridge, by agreement or condemnation in accordance with the laws of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation, acquire all right, title, and interest in such bridge and the approaches and appurtenances thereto for the purpose of maintaining and operating such bridge as a free bridge. If such bridge is acquired as aforesaid by condemnation, in determining the measure of damages or compensation to be paid for the same, there shall not be included any credit or allowance for good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but same shall be limited to such an amount not exceeding the original cost thereof as shall represent the fair value of the bridge and its appurtenances at the time of such acquisition. After five years from the date of acquiring such bridge by such State or States or any official agency or agencies thereof, or any political or other subdivision or subdivisions thereof, the same shall be maintained and operated as a free bridge.

SEC. 4. The said Charles L. Moss, A. E. Harris, and T. C. Shattuck, their heirs, administrators, and assigns, shall immediately upon the completion of such bridge file with the State Highway Departments of the States of Oklahoma and Texas an itemized sworn statement of the actual original cost of such bridge and its approaches and appurtenances, including any reasonable actual expenditures for engineering and legal services and any reasonable fees, discounts, and expenditures incurred in connection with the original financing thereof. Such an itemized statement of cost may be investigated by the highway department of either of such States at any time within three years after the completion of such bridge and verified and corrected, and its findings shall be conclusive upon all persons, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 5. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the said Charles L. Moss, A. E. Harris, and T. C. Shattuck, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, appropriate, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches and terminals as are possessed by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State or States in which such real estate and other property are located upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State or States; and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation and expropriation of property in such State or States.

SEC. 3. The said Charles L. Moss, A. E. Harris, and T. C. Shattuck, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, are hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and the rates so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under the authority contained in such act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. After the date of completion of such bridge, as determined by the Secretary of War, either the State of Texas, the State of Oklahoma, any political subdivision of either of such States within or adjoining which any part of such bridge is located, or any two or more of them jointly, may at any time acquire and take over all right, title, and interest in such bridge and approaches, and interests in real property necessary therefor, by purchase, or by condemnation in accordance with the law of either of such States governing the acquisition of private property for public purposes by condemnation. If at any time after the expiration of 20 years after the completion of such bridge it is acquired by condemnation, the amount of damages or compensation to be allowed shall not include good will, going value, or prospective revenues or profits, but shall be limited to the sum of (1) the actual cost of constructing such bridge and approaches, less a reasonable deduction for actual depreciation in respect of such bridge and approaches, (2) the actual cost of acquiring such interests in real property, (3) actual financing and promotion costs (not to exceed 10 per cent of the sum of the cost of construction of such bridge and approaches and the acquisition of such interests in real property), and (4) actual expenditures for necessary improvements.

SEC. 5. If such bridge shall be taken over and acquired by the States or political subdivisions thereof under the provisions of section 4 of this act, the same may thereafter be operated as a toll bridge; in fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide as far as possible a sufficient fund to pay for the cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches, to pay an adequate return on the cost thereof, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor within a period of not to exceed 30 years from the date of acquiring

the same. After a sinking fund sufficient to pay the cost of acquiring such bridge and its approaches shall have been provided the bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls or the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper care, repair, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and its approaches. An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for operating, repairing, and maintaining the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept, and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 6. The said Charles L. Moss, A. E. Harris, and T. C. Shattuck, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall, within 90 days after the completion of such bridge, file with the Secretary of War a sworn itemized statement showing the actual original cost of constructing such bridge and approaches, including the actual cost of acquiring interests in real property and actual financing and promotion costs. Within three years after the completion of such bridge the Secretary of War may investigate the actual cost of such bridge, and for such purpose the said Charles L. Moss, A. E. Harris, and T. C. Shattuck, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, shall make available to the Secretary of War all of their records in connection with the financing and construction thereof. The findings of the Secretary of War as to such actual original cost shall be conclusive, subject only to review in a court of equity for fraud or gross mistake.

SEC. 7. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the said Charles L. Moss, A. E. Harris, and T. C. Shattuck, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or which shall acquire the same by mortgage, foreclosure, or otherwise is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

SEC. 8. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ARKANSAS RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. BINGHAM. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 9634) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Arkansas River at or near the city of Dardanelle, Yell County, Ark., and I submit a report (No. 719) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill just reported by the Senator from Connecticut.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by Congress, approved March 3, 1925, to be built by the Yell and Pope County bridge district, Dardanelle and Russellville, Ark., across the Arkansas River at or near the city of Dardanelle, in the county of Yell, in the State of Arkansas, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 4131) to provide for clearing, leveling, and preparing land for irrigation on Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ODDIE:

A bill (S. 4132) to amend section 1 of the act of June 7, 1924, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, in Nevada, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 4133) granting an increase of pension to Belle S. Chaffin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4134) granting a pension to Thomas Lamb; and A bill (S. 4135) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Kemp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A bill (S. 4136) granting an increase of pension to Sophronia J. Vertrees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4137) providing for the retirement of Lieut. Commander Henry Emile Quenstedt, United States Naval Reserve Force, as within the provisions of the act approved July 12, 1921; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 4138) granting the consent of Congress to the State highway department of Georgia to construct a bridge across the St. Marys River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4139) for the relief of Margaret Doyle, administratrix of the estate of James Doyle, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4140) granting grade, rank, pay, and allowances of retired warrant officer to Sergt. Otto Krause; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4141) for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of General Orders, No. 195, War Department, June 29, 1863, for the presentation of medals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON:

A bill (S. 4142) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease unallotted lands within the Colorado River Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 4143) to grant 500,000 acres of land to the State of Arizona for the benefit of disabled miners and their dependents; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. McKINLEY:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) relating to the use of the metric system of weights and measures in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

VALUE OF MUSCLE SHOALS TO THE SOUTH

Mr. DILL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Judson King, which is entitled "The Value of Muscle Shoals to the South."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article referred to is as follows:

[Bulletin No. 104, April 10, 1926]

NATIONAL POPULAR GOVERNMENT LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C.

By Judson King, Director

THE VALUE OF MUSCLE SHOALS TO THE SOUTH

Muscle Shoals has been generating power since September with Army engineers in charge. The Alabama Power Co. has bought this current at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour and sold it at 850 mills, or 8.5 cents, per kilowatt-hour domestic use and at proportionately high rates for power users. Senator McKELLAR estimates the profits thus far at around \$3,000,000. It costs 2 mills to send a kilowatt-hour 300 miles. Wilson Dam can supply current to cities, homes, farms, and factories in 14 States within 300 miles from Muscle Shoals.

Electric energy is now being sent successfully as a business and engineering proposition not only 300 miles but as high as 550 miles in the United States to-day. It is certain that future scientific discoveries will lengthen the distance and cheapen the cost.

President Thomas W. Martin, of the Alabama Power Co., in a letter to Senator NORRIS on February 24, 1926, states that the transmission lines of his company are interconnected to supply power in the States of Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, North and South Carolina, and presently Florida and Mississippi.

He furnished the Senator with a statement of the amount of energy he had purchased from the United States Government at Muscle Shoals. Through the kindness of the office of Major General Taylor, Chief of Engineers of the War Department, I have verified Mr. Martin's figures as correct and been able to bring them up to March 26. Here they are—

Alabama Power Co.

(Wilson Dam—Net generation and charges)

	Net generation, kilowatt-hours per month	Payment to United States Government per month
1925		
September.....	7,431,000	\$14,862
October.....	10,671,000	21,342
November.....	12,847,000	25,694
December.....	13,480,000	26,960
1926		
January.....	12,321,000	24,642
February.....	13,717,000	27,434
Mar. 26.....	14,694,000	29,388
Total.....	85,161,000	173,322

No blame attaches to Mr. Martin for getting Government current as cheaply as he can nor to the War Department for selling to the only available distributing system on an uncertain short-time contract until the disposition of the shoals is finally decided.

Only 4 units of the Muscle Shoals plant are now operating, as against a total of 18. Engineering opinion differs as to whether the production cost to Uncle Sam will be 2 mills, 4, or 6 mills per kilowatt when the plant is in full operation. Be that as it may, it is certain that there is no sound financial excuse for the people of the South to continue to pay the power companies from 8 to 10 cents per kilowatt-hour for current that costs from 4 to 6 mills at the plant to make and which they might purchase cheaply under the Norris plan.

TRANSMISSION COST 2 MILLS PER KILOWATT-HOUR

Ontario to-day shoots a kilowatt of electricity from Niagara Falls to Windsor, opposite Detroit, 252 line miles (200 miles as the crow flies), for less than 2 mills; and those great engineers, Arthur Powell Davis, former chief engineer of the United States Reclamation Service, and Prof. W. F. Durand, of Leland Stanford University, president of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, in 1925 testified that it would cost only 2 mills per kilowatt to transmit power approximately 300 miles from the proposed Boulder Canyon Dam in the Colorado River. Muscle Shoals current can be distributed at like cost.

It would be of priceless value to the whole American people if they could know exactly what profits are being made by the Alabama Power Co. on the energy now purchased from the United States Government at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, and also what the profit would be for 50 years with Muscle Shoals in full operation. But no figure of scientific value can be arrived at because the financial industrial operations of the power companies are so ramified and their systems of bookkeeping intentionally made so complicated, befuddling, and mysterious that no one save a very few insiders know what the actual profits and costs of operation are that are necessary to such an estimate. No engineer or accountant could discover from reports to State utility commissions the factors required. This is one of the most conspicuous points of failure in "regulation" as now practiced. I am too much of a gentleman even to ask Mr. Martin to disclose his valuable business secrets. He would be a prize mutt if he told me so that I could tell you.

It was this difficulty of arriving at exact estimates that no doubt led Senator McKELLAR to state such wide variations in the possible profits of the Alabama Power Co. from Muscle Shoals power to date quoted above. The figures were taken from his speech in the Senate on March 4, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4707. I quote further:

"The Government got for the power given to the Alabama Power Co. in November \$26,000. What does the company get for it? If they sold at 1 cent per kilowatt they would get \$130,000 a month * * * at 2 cents it would be \$260,000 * * * at 3 cents it would be \$390,000 * * *. If they sold it at 4 cents, approximately one-half what they charge their customers, it would be \$520,000 a month * * *. If they sold it at 8½ cents, the highest price, they would get \$1,105,000 for it. But if we suggest that it sells on the average of only 4 cents, the company would get \$6,240,000 a year profit on this business * * *. They have already made, according to the figures General Taylor furnished, something more than \$3,000,000 during the six months referred to."

Mr. Earl Sparling, able Washington correspondent of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, in a dispatch to his papers February 26 last, gave some figures which throw another possible sidelight on this perplexing problem. He states that according to figures just made public by the Alabama Public Service Commission "the Alabama Power Co. earned almost 50 cents net income on every dollar's worth of electricity sold in 1925 * * *. The company earned \$10,415,887 gross income from the sale of electricity last year. Expenses of operation were only \$5,231,461."

\$1,247,971,464.60 PROFIT IN 50 YEARS

Muscle Shoals under the Norris plan is worth billions in direct saving on power costs and many more billions as a regulator of private monopoly by competition. Here is a minimum guess on what it is worth to the power combine.

War Department engineers now estimate the yearly power output of Wilson dam in full operation at 700,000,000 kilowatt-hour primary, and 1,490,000,000 kilowatt-hour secondary; total 2,190,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Engineers of the Giant Power Survey of Pennsylvania report that the electric power utilities of that State sold during 1924 approximately five and one-fourth billion kilowatt-hours for \$128,000,000, or approximately 2½ cents per kilowatt-hour. This includes generation, transmission, distribution utilization, and fixed charges and profits. The engineers assert a profit of approximately 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. Generation is by both steam and water.

To be safe let us make the violent assumption that it will cost as much to generate energy at Muscle Shoals by water power alone as in Pennsylvania with both steam and water. Let us cut that 4 mills profit in half and make it 2 mills, to be ultraconservative. A tre-

mendous market awaits Muscle Shoals power, and we may assume the plant will be run at full capacity.

2,190,000,000 KILOWATT-HOURS MULTIPLIED BY 2 MILLS EQUAL \$4,380,000
YEARLY PROFIT

But interest? Say, at 6 per cent compounded annually \$4,380,000 each year for 50 years. To be business-like, we must add that. But to figure it staggered me. Life is short. So I asked my friend, Mr. Geo. D. Lane, the comptometer man on the floor above. He said, "Leave it to me." In less than an hour his demonstrator, Miss Lulu Fike, came down and handed me the figure. It was \$1,347,971,464.60.

Figure it out for yourselves what a profit of 4 mills per kilowatt-hour would yield.

Is it not perfectly clear why Mr. Coolidge's friends and political supporters, the big power men, after calm consideration in the light of safe public policy and sound economic principles, are convinced that they and not Uncle Sam should operate Muscle Shoals?

ARMY ENGINEERS EFFICIENT

However, the United States Government has been operating the power plant at Muscle Shoals for eight months. Notwithstanding vociferous propaganda of the National Electric Light Association, many Senators and Representatives, et al., that this Government can do nothing successfully, it is not of record that General Taylor and Major Tyler, engineer in charge of the plant at Muscle Shoals, have done a bad job. In fact, they have done a good job, and I doubt not they would take just as much pleasure in employing their technical skill in behalf of the people of the Southern States as of the Alabama Power Co. As Army men, however, they can say nothing as to their preferences but obey orders of their chief, the President of the United States.

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE VERSUS SENATOR NORRIS

As to the present President of the United States, Mr. Calvin Coolidge, let us remind ourselves that he is personally leading the fight to deliver this magnificent natural resource and a power development that has cost American taxpayers \$150,000,000 into private hands for private profit. Whether he gives it to the Power Trust or to some great manufacturing concern makes no difference to the South. The people will still go on paying high rates for electric energy.

As opposed to this policy, Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS is still struggling against terrific odds to keep Muscle Shoals in public possession and permit the cities, the manufacturers, the farmers, and the home owners of the South to purchase their electric energy at cost as in Ontario. His bill, S. 2147, would permit a city like Memphis, for example, if it had its own local distributing system, to run a high-power wire to Muscle Shoals and buy its current wholesale for distribution by itself.

LAND VALUES

Every person in the South who owns a piece of real estate, as well as every business and professional man, if economically wise, will be in favor of public operation of Muscle Shoals. The cheaper the cost of power the more rapidly and surely will manufacturers be attracted, the more swiftly will industrial development proceed, the greater the population will become, and the whole process be properly reflected in the increased value of land. Land values thus soundly created are not of the speculative ruinous kind due to artificially stimulated "booms," and the prosperity thus generated comes to stay.

The rapid industrial development of Los Angeles is substantial and is due to the fact that the municipally owned and operated electric water and power system has furnished manufacturers the cheapest power and water supply to be found in the Southwest. This is the fundamental reason why Los Angeles is outstripping San Francisco as a manufacturing center.

LOW PUBLIC AND HIGH PRIVATE TAX RATES

It becomes therefore pertinent to inquire into the prices consumers would have to pay under the Norris plan or under the continuance of the present system as advocated by President Coolidge. The average citizen is easily fooled by words. Call a thing a "rate" and he will cheerfully pay. Call it a "tax" and he will howl. President Coolidge is a great advocate of tax reduction. He has recently put through a bill which slightly reduces the tax of common folks, but untaxes the big rich to the tune of billions of dollars. His power policy—that of Hoover and the power trust—in effect sanctions the right of the power companies, owned chiefly by the aforesaid big rich, to levy unconscionable private taxes upon the aforesaid common folks for electric service. Senator Norris, however, desires the tax levied for electric service to be the least possible, therefore he favors Muscle Shoals remaining in the hands of the people.

The difference in these two systems of taxation for electric service may be discovered by comparing the rates now paid to private companies in a few of the cities that might be served by Muscle Shoals with what the people of similar cities and towns are paying in Ontario.

The Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia reports that 40 kilowatts per month is the average residential consumption of electricity. Taking this as a basis, and applying the rates quoted in

the 1924 rate book of the National Electric Light Association, and the 17th (1924) Annual Report of the Ontario Hydroelectric Commission, we get the following results:

Coolidge tax as of existing rates in Southern States, 40 kilowatt-hours per month		Norris tax as of existing rates in Ontario, 40 kilowatt-hours per month	
Birmingham, Ala.	\$3.06	Toronto	\$1.05
Mobile, Ala.	3.60	Windsor	1.20
Montgomery, Ala.	3.02	St. Marys	1.20
Atlanta, Ga.	3.15	London	1.15
Augusta, Ga.	3.60	St. Thomas	1.15
Columbus, Ga.	4.00	Galt	1.02
Macon, Ga.	3.60	Woodstock	1.15
Savannah, Ga.	3.60	Kitchener	1.15
Jackson, Miss.	6.00	Waterloo	1.02
Meridian, Miss.	4.56	St. Jacobs	1.38
Columbia, S. C.	3.24	Weston	1.02
Greenville, S. C.	3.42	Brampton	1.02
Spartanburg, S. C.	3.53	Acton	1.20
Charlotte, N. C.	3.42	Glencoe	1.56
Knoxville, Tenn.	3.96	Woodstock	1.15
Memphis, Tenn.	2.88	Preston	1.33
Nashville, Tenn.	3.96	Hamilton	1.15
Little Rock, Ark.	4.00	Sarnia	1.20
Pine Bluff, Ark.	5.40	Stratford	1.20
New Orleans, La.	3.63	Windsor	1.20
Pensacola, Fla.	4.94	Guelph	1.15
Lexington, Ky.	3.24	Dresden	1.20
Louisville, Ky.	3.04	Sarnia	1.20
Cincinnati, Ohio	3.20	Windsor	1.20
Evansville, Ind.	2.70	Windsor	1.20
E. St. Louis, Ill.	3.80	Chatham	1.20
St. Louis, Mo.	2.66	Windsor	1.20

A FULLY ELECTRIFIED HOME IN HAMILTON, ONTARIO

But 40 kilowatts per month is only enough electric current to light a house. The average American housewife longs for an electric washing machine, irons, sweeper, electric range for cooking, etc., but "electricity costs too much" and so she gives it up, and contents herself with light only. Muscle Shoals and similar power sites is the answer to this home need, but American women are kept in ignorance of how cheaply electric current can be sold and so think it is not possible for them. But it should be made as available for them as it is now for the women of Ontario, Canada. Let me illustrate.

Rev. J. J. Morton, of Hamilton, Ontario, lives in a 16-room house at 39 Park Street South. The total household consists of 12 persons. The home is managed by his very capable daughter, Miss Winona. Her electrical equipment is as follows:

Thirty-nine lights, sizes 40 to 200 watts (ordinary bulb is 50).
Westinghouse electric range, with four top burners and oven.
Electric washing machine.
Hoover sweeper.
Two-burner hot plate for boiling clothes.
Toaster.
Electric iron.
Grill.

You will note Miss Morton likes lots of light. I surmise she has one of those 200-watt bulbs in her kitchen, and perhaps Doctor Morton has a good-sized one in his study. Women especially will be alive to the amount of cooking, washing, ironing, and sweeping in such a home, and think so much electricity extravagant for a minister's home; but prepare to gasp—it costs Miss Morton only about \$50 a year to run all this equipment.

Americans have a good right to doubt the truth of my statement, so in self-defense I reproduce here as nearly as possible on a mimeograph the Reverend Morton's paid bill for the two months ending December 12, 1924. Note that Miss Morton used 884 kilowatt-hours, for which they paid \$7.99, a net cost of only 0.0128 cents per kilowatt-hour.

HAMILTON HYDRO ELECTRIC SYSTEM

RESIDENCE ACCOUNT

Date due, December 26.

Rev. J. J. Morton, 39 Park Street, South.	
Fixed charge, 3 cents per 100 square feet	\$1.32
Consumption at 2 cents per kilowatt-hour	2.64
Consumption at 1 cent per kilowatt-hour	4.92
Gross bill	8.88
Discount, 10 per cent	.89
Net bill	7.99

Meter readings furnished on request.
Last meter reading, December 12, 1924.
Consumption, kilowatt-hours, 624.

I have examined the original bill reproduced and certify that the above is a true copy as showing the amount of electricity used and the price paid.

[SEAL.]

MARY V. JUDGE, Notary Public.

My commission expires April 15, 1930.

How can it be? Simple enough. The Mortons buy current retail from the city of Hamilton. The city purchases current wholesale from the great Ontario hydroelectric superpower system, which is also publicly owned and operated. The generating plant is at Niagara Falls, Canadian side. The profits of the system, State and municipal, are distributed in the shape of low rates to its owners—the people.

That is, they utilize their own river for their own benefit, just as Senator NORRIS wants Muscle Shoals utilized for the benefit of the people of the Southern States who own the Tennessee River.

SHOULD REVEREND MORTON MOVE TO DIXIE LAND

Now, if Reverend Morton should desire to move from Ontario to Dixie land, I imagine Miss Winona would instantly say: "Father, I shall want to take my electrical equipment along, so please find out about rates in the Southern States."

So let us suppose he should write Senator Thomas Hefflin (Democrat now working with Coolidge), of Alabama, "624 kilowatts costs me \$7.99 in Ontario, what will it cost in Alabama with the understanding that 300 kilowatts is used for cooking?"

All Senator HEFFLIN could do would be to respond to the effect: Dear Doctor Morton: I have consulted the mayor of my home town, Lafayette, and the 1924 rate book of the National Electric Light Association and find as follows: If you were to come to my home town instead of \$7.99 it would cost you, \$50.88.

In Birmingham they will charge you, \$31.89.

And by the same token Senator JOSEPH ROBINSON, of Arkansas, might write: "In Little Rock instead of \$7.99 they will charge you \$49."

Senator PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, against the Norris plan, could respond: "In Jackson instead of \$7.99 it will cost you \$61.79."

Senator BROUSSARD, Democrat, of Louisiana, who voted with Coolidge, could respond:

"DEAR DOCTOR: New Orleans has two electric power companies, and Miss Morton can get the benefits of competition. The Consumers Light & Power Co. will charge her \$36.39, instead of \$7.99, and the New Orleans Public Service (Inc.) will charge her \$36.39."

Senator ERNST, Republican, of Kentucky, could reply: "In Louisville instead of \$7.99 it will cost Miss Morton \$39.62."

Senator TYSON, Democrat, of Tennessee, who helps Coolidge while his colleague, Senator MCKELLAR, will not, might respond:

"In Knoxville instead of \$7.99 it will cost you \$27.30; in Nashville, \$40.72; in Chattanooga, \$18."

Senator OVERMAN, Democrat, of North Carolina, who voted against the Coolidge proposition, might suggest:

In Asheville it would cost you \$40.90 instead of \$7.99.

Senator SMITH, Democrat, of South Carolina, who believes the South should have the benefit of Muscle Shoals, their own property, and so was against Mr. Coolidge's proposal, could communicate:

In Columbia it will cost you \$39.70, and in Greenville \$43.63 instead of \$7.99.

Senator GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, who voted "No" on the Coolidge proposition, could write:

"In Atlanta 624 kilowatts for which you paid \$7.99 would cost you \$35.43."

Senator FLETCHER, Democrat, of Florida, who voted with Coolidge, could say:

"A publicly owned plant at Jacksonville will do it for \$16.85, while a private plant at Pensacola would charge you \$63.20 instead of \$7.99."

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Missouri, who voted with Coolidge, could advise:

"In St. Louis I find you will have to pay \$17.16 instead of \$7.99."

Senator MCKINLEY, Republican, of Illinois, who strongly supported the Coolidge proposition, could write:

"In East St. Louis the private company will charge you \$24.09. There is a municipally owned plant over in Springfield run by Willis J. Spaulding which will charge you \$14.56 instead of \$7.99."

Senator WILLIS, Republican, of Ohio, who always supports Coolidge, could answer:

"In Cincinnati your bill would be \$22.74 instead of \$7.99."

Senator JAMES WATSON of Indiana, Republican leader who voted with Coolidge, might reply:

"In Evansville the cost would be \$34.83 instead of \$7.99."

SMALL POWER USERS

If the commercial and small power users were aware of the vast sums public operation of Muscle Shoals would save them, it is inconceivable that as intelligent business men they would consent for a moment to the Coolidge-Hoover program.

As a matter of historic fact, it was the small manufacturers and business men of Ontario who started the movement 20 years ago to capture the Canadian Niagara power for themselves and all the people. They succeeded, and to-day have not only the largest but the most efficient and cheapest superpower system in the world.

Their financial success should arrest the attention of men who desire to promote the South because Ontario "Hydro" is a success, despite the false propaganda of the National Electric Light Association, publicity agent for the power trust, which circulated the utterly false and discredited report of William H. Murray in 1922 and are at least sympathetic with if not actively behind the circulation of the equally ridiculous attack on the Ontario system by the late Professor Mavor, which has been sent gratuitously by the thousands to prominent men throughout the South; a book laughed at in Ontario. It is not

worthy that Mavor does not quote electric light and power rates, which is the real point at issue.

Small southern power users will be interested in the following comparison of rates, which I have had especially made for this bulletin by one of the most competent active electrical engineers in the Nation, whose name I can not here disclose for protective reasons.

The installation considered for comparison was a 10-horsepower motor, operating 8 hours per day, 30 days a month, at full load for the entire period, giving as a result 1,560 kilowatt-hours consumed for the month and a peak load of 10 horsepower of $7\frac{1}{2}$ kilowatts.

The rates for the Ontario cities are taken from the seventeenth annual report (1924) of the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, pages 484-490. The Tennessee rates are derived from the 1924 Rate Book of the National Electric Light Association, pages 419-425.

The Ontario cities are served from the Queenstown hydroelectric plant below Niagara Falls, the Tennessee cities from the great hydroelectric plant of the Tennessee Power Co. at Hales Bar, about 10 miles below Chattanooga on the Tennessee River. The above data is given to meet vague talk and quibbling, and to furnish engineers, accountants, and technical men the exact factors upon which the following figures are based:

Comparative cost of a 10-horsepower motor in Tennessee and Ontario

City	Approximate distance from generating station	Population	Net bill
	Miles		
Chattanooga, Tenn.	10	60,163	80.65
St. Catharine, Ontario	10	21,194	15.56
Nashville, Tenn.	100	121,128	84.44
London, Ontario	100	61,369	21.02
Knoxville, Tenn.	120	88,869	68.76
Windsor, Ontario	200	42,122	28.17

On April 26 the bids for Muscle Shoals now being received by the joint congressional committee will be reported to Congress for action. And the next great battle will begin. It is evident that two great forces are in conflict—the power monopoly as against certain industrial interests which desire to utilize Muscle Shoals for manufacturing purposes only.

In either case the supreme, direct boon which this great plan might be to the southern people will be lost to them. The power crowd will generate low and sell high, as at present. The manufacturers will use the site for themselves.

The Norris plan establishes real competition between the existing Power Trust and the people's own plant. It will give the cities, the farmers, the manufacturers, and everybody the chance to buy power from Uncle Sam at cost and distribute it themselves. That chance alone will bring power rates tumbling all over the South, just as the Cleveland (Ohio) Illuminating Co. sells domestic lighting now at 5 cents per kilowatt hour, instead of 10 cents as it once did, because of the presence of the municipal 3-cent plant, one-quarter its size.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and a joint resolution of the House were severally read twice by title and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 3791. An act to purchase a painting of the several ships of the United States Navy in 1891 and entitled "Peace";

H. R. 3990. An act for the erection of a monument upon the Revolutionary battle field of White Plains, State of New York; and

H. J. Res. 176. Joint resolution establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversaries of the independence of Vermont and the battle of Bennington, and authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance; to the Committee on the Library.

H. R. 5359. An act authorizing the purchase by the Secretary of Commerce of a site and the construction and equipment of a building thereon for use as a master track scale and test car depot, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 6252. An act amending section 52 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9511. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to remit or change deductions or fines imposed upon contractors for mail service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PROPOSED WALKER RIVER DAM, NEVADA

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2826) for the construction of an irrigation dam on Walker River, Nev., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1226) to amend the trading with the enemy act.

The message also announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 99. An act for the relief of the owner of the lighter *Eastman No. 14*;

S. 113. An act for the relief of the owner of the American barge *Texaco No. 153*;

S. 547. An act for the relief of James W. Laxson;

S. 1131. An act for the relief of James Doherty; and

S. 2338. An act authorizing the President to reappoint Chester A. Rothwell, formerly a captain of Engineers, United States Army, an officer of Engineers, United States Army.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6559) to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, two weeks ago to-day the public buildings bill was placed before the Senate. It has been the unfinished business for a large part of the time during the past two weeks. During some days the bill has never been mentioned, and other matters which seemed to be of more importance to Senators have been debated. I have endeavored to give every Senator an opportunity to present what seemed to be reasonable legislation.

In the interest of economy I believe the bill ought to have prompt action, consideration, and enactment. It is costing the Government of the United States \$70,000 every day for rentals, and every time a lease expires on a rented building the charges are advanced; so that, considering efficiency in the conduct of the public business and the interests of economy all around, I believe every day of delay in the enactment of this proposed legislation is costing the Government \$75,000.

Of course, the entire expense can not be relieved immediately by the passage of this measure, but we can, at least, begin to relieve the situation. I am not going to make any speech or remarks in reference to the bill. It has been debated pro and con, by both sides. I am going to ask that we may make some progress to-day and that we agree to the amendment reported by the committee on page 2, line 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 1, page 2, line 7, after the word "purposes," the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds propose to insert the words "giving preference, where he considers conditions justify such action, to cases where sites for public buildings have heretofore been acquired or authorized to be acquired," so as to read:

That, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide suitable accommodations in the District of Columbia for the executive departments and independent establishments of the Government not under any executive department, and for courthouses, post offices, immigration stations, customhouses, marine hospitals, quarantine stations, and other public buildings of the classes under the control of the Treasury Department in the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, he is hereby authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such sites and additions to sites as he may deem necessary, and to cause to be constructed thereon, and upon lands belonging to the Government conveniently located and available for the purpose (but exclusive of military or naval reservations), adequate and suitable buildings for any of the foregoing purposes, giving preference, where he considers conditions justify such action, to cases where sites for public buildings have heretofore been acquired or authorized to be acquired.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate to this remarkable bill and to insert in the bill instead of the words "the Secretary of the Treasury," the name of Mr. Mellon, who will have full charge of the expenditures of the moneys proposed to be appropriated by the bill, of the location of the sites of the proposed buildings, the fixing of their cost, and everything else which is proposed to be done by the bill; in other words, I merely wish to call the attention of the Senate how the bill would read if we would strike out the words "the Secretary of the Treasury," and the personal pronouns referring to him where they occur in the bill, and insert the words "Mr. Mellon." Should that be done, it would very plainly be shown just what authority we are proposing to give one man.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. HARRISON. Not just for the present. I want to finish my statement.

Mr. LENROOT. I hope the Senator will yield at this point.

Mr. HARRISON. I will not yield now. I will yield to the Senator presently.

Mr. President, should the pending bill be amended by the substitution of the name of Mr. Mellon, as I have suggested, it would read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, to enable Mr. Mellon to provide suitable accommodations in the District of Columbia for the executive departments and independent establishments of the Government not under any executive department, and for courthouses, post offices, immigration stations, customhouses, marine hospitals, quarantine stations, and other public buildings of the classes under the control of Mr. Mellon in the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, Mr. Mellon is hereby authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such sites and additions to sites as Mr. Mellon may deem necessary, and to cause to be constructed thereon, and upon lands belonging to the Government conveniently located and available for the purpose (but exclusive of military or naval reservations), adequate and suitable buildings for any of the foregoing purposes, giving preference, where Mr. Mellon considers conditions justify such action, to cases where sites for public buildings have heretofore been acquired or authorized to be acquired, and to enlarge, remodel, and extend existing public buildings under the control of Mr. Mellon, and to purchase buildings, if found to be adequate, adaptable, and suitable for the purposes of this act, together with the sites thereof, and to remodel, enlarge, or extend such buildings and provide proper approaches and other necessary improvements to the sites thereof. When a building is about to be constructed on a site heretofore acquired and such site is found by Mr. Mellon to be unsuitable for its intended purpose, Mr. Mellon is hereby further authorized and empowered to acquire a new site in lieu thereof by purchase, condemnation, exchange, or otherwise, and to dispose of the present site by public sale and to execute the necessary quitclaim deed of conveyance: *Provided*, That in carrying into effect the provisions of this act, in so far as relates to buildings to be used in whole or in part for post-office purposes, Mr. Mellon, under regulations to be prescribed by Mr. Mellon, shall act jointly with the Postmaster General in the selection of towns or cities in which buildings are to be constructed and the selection of sites therein: *Provided further*, That all sketches, plans, and estimates for buildings shall be approved by Mr. Mellon and the head of each executive department who will have officials located in such building.

Mr. Mellon is authorized to carry on the construction work herein authorized by contract, or otherwise, as Mr. Mellon deems most advantageous to the United States, and in case appropriations for projects are made in part only to enter into contracts for the completion in full of each of said projects.

In all cases where the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia, under the provisions of this act, requires the utilization, in the opinion of Mr. Mellon, of contiguous squares as sites thereof, authority is hereby given for closing and vacating such portions of streets as lie between such squares and such alleys as intersect such squares, and the portions of such streets and alleys so closed and vacated shall thereupon become parts of such sites.

SEC. 2. (a) The work of preparing designs and other drawings, estimates, specifications, and awarding of contracts, as well as the supervision of the work authorized under the provisions of this act, shall be performed by the Office of the Supervising Architect, of Mr. Mellon's department, under the direction of Mr. Mellon, except as otherwise provided in this act, but in designing and constructing buildings under the provisions of this act preference shall be given, so far as practicable, to standardized types, and in other cases where possible and appropriate to commercial types modified to meet governmental requirements rather than to buildings of monumental character.

(b) Mr. Mellon is authorized, in his discretion, (1) to procure advisory assistance when deemed advantageous in special cases involving design or engineering features, and (2) to employ, to the extent deemed necessary by Mr. Mellon in connection with the construction of buildings for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, the architects who were successful in competition heretofore held for a building for the then Department of Commerce and Labor, and to pay reasonable compensation for such services.

(c) Mr. Mellon is authorized to employ such additional technical, scientific, and clerical assistance in or under the Office of the Supervising Architect, both in the District of Columbia and in the field, as Mr. Mellon deems necessary, and to fix such rates of compensation therefor as Mr. Mellon deems proper, not, however, in excess of the maximum rates paid for the same or similar service in other departments, such employment to be made in accordance with the civil service laws, rules, and regulations, and to submit to Congress through customary channels estimates for appropriations for compensation for such personal services, and for travel, subsistence, and other expenses involved in making any investigation or survey of building conditions or in the examination of sites which Mr. Mellon may find to be necessary.

SEC. 3. In carrying into effect the provisions of existing law authorizing the acquisition of land for sites or enlargements thereof, and the erection, enlargement, extension, and remodeling of public buildings in the several cities enumerated in Senate Document No. 28, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, and including public buildings at St. Louis, Mo., authorized by the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913, amended by the act of January 17, 1920, and Newark, N. J., authorized by the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913, amended by the act of August 11, 1913, extension of the Federal building at Utica, N. Y., authorized by the public buildings act approved March 4, 1913, extension of the Federal building at Missoula, Mont., authorized by the public buildings act of March 4, 1913, the additional buildings for the Marine Hospital at Chicago, Ill., authorized by the act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, approved July 19, 1919, and for medical officers' quarters at the marine hospital at Savannah, Ga., authorized by the act making appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, approved July 19, 1919, and for the construction of marine-hospital facilities at Detroit, Mich., authorized by the act, Public No. 278, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved June 7, 1924, Mr. Mellon is hereby authorized to disregard the limit of cost fixed by Congress for each project, to purchase additional land for enlargement of sites and to enter into contracts for all or so many of said buildings heretofore authorized to be constructed, but not yet under contract, as may be possible within a total additional limit of cost of \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That in constructing the buildings embraced herein Mr. Mellon is authorized, in his discretion, to provide space in such buildings for other activities or branches of the public service not specifically enumerated in the act or acts authorizing the acquisition of the sites, or the construction of the buildings, or both.

SEC. 4. Mr. Mellon shall submit annually and from time to time as may be required estimates to the Bureau of the Budget, in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, showing in complete detail the various amounts it is proposed to expend under the authority of this act during the fiscal year for which said estimates are submitted.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the sum of \$150,000,000, in addition to the amount authorized in section 3 hereof, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, but under this authorization and from appropriations (exclusive of appropriations made for "remodeling and enlarging public buildings") heretofore made for the acquisition of sites for, or the construction, enlarging, remodeling, or extension of, public buildings under the control of Mr. Mellon, not more than \$25,000,000 in the aggregate shall be expended annually: *Provided*, That such amount as is necessary, not to exceed \$50,000,000 of the total amount authorized to be expended under the provisions of this act, shall be available for projects in the District of Columbia, and not more than \$10,000,000 thereof shall be expended annually: *Provided further*, That expenditures outside the District of Columbia under the provisions of this section shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000,000 annually in any one of the States, Territories, or possessions of the United States.

In each of the cities in which a site is to be acquired under the provisions of this act Mr. Mellon shall solicit proposals by public advertisement. Such advertisement shall be published for a period of 20 days in one of the newspapers in said city having the largest circulation for the sale of land suitable for the purpose. Mr. Mellon shall cause the sites offered, and such others as may be found to be suitable or desirable for the purpose, to be examined in person by an agent employed or detailed for the purpose, who shall make written report to Mr. Mellon of the results of said examination and of his recommendation thereon and the reasons therefor, which shall be accompanied by the original proposals and all maps, plats, and statements which shall have come into his possession relating to the said proposed sites.

That in case a site or additions to a site acquired under the provisions of this act contains a building or buildings, Mr. Mellon is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to rent until their removal becomes necessary such of said buildings as may be purchased by the Government, or the land on which the same may be located where the buildings are reserved by the vendors, at a fair rental value, the proceeds thereof to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, and a report of the proceedings to be submitted to Congress annually.

That, so far as practicable, all buildings constructed, enlarged, or extended under the provisions of this act shall be unexposed to danger of fire from adjacent buildings by an open space of at least 40 feet on each side, including streets and alleys: *Provided*, That Mr. Mellon may, in his discretion, acquire sites on which an open space of the extent hereinbefore specified can not be reserved, and Mr. Mellon is likewise authorized, whenever in Mr. Mellon's judgment such action is necessary and warranted, to reduce the open space about any Federal building heretofore constructed and under the custody and control of Mr. Mellon's department.

In carrying into effect the provisions of this act, if Mr. Mellon deems it to be to the best interests of the Government to construct Federal

buildings to take the place of existing Federal buildings, Mr. Mellon is hereby authorized to cause the present buildings to be demolished in order that the sites may be utilized in whole or in part for such buildings, or where in Mr. Mellon's judgment it is more advantageous to construct a Federal building on a different site in the same city, to sell any such building or buildings and the site or sites thereof, at such time and on such terms as Mr. Mellon deems proper, and to convey the same to the respective purchasers thereof by the usual quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of the sales thereof in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. The provisions of section 10 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1920, approved March 1, 1919, relating to the assignment of space in public buildings in the District of Columbia, shall apply to all buildings constructed, extended, or enlarged under the provisions of this act in the District of Columbia, and no land for sites or enlargement of sites therefor shall be acquired or land belonging to the United States be taken for sites or enlargement of sites therefor without prior approval of the commission created by said act of March 1, 1919; no contract shall be let for any building or the enlargement or extension of any building in the District of Columbia, under the provisions of this act without the approval of said commission as to the assignment and general arrangement of space therein; and said commission shall determine the order in which buildings or enlargement of buildings in the District of Columbia under the provisions of this act shall be constructed.

SEC. 7. That Mr. Mellon is hereby further authorized and empowered to cause such survey and investigations of public-building conditions to be made and such data obtained as Mr. Mellon deems necessary properly to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. Several days ago, when this matter was before the Senate, some question was raised about conferring upon the Secretary of the Treasury the right to purchase such sites and erect such public buildings at such cost as he might designate; and it was thought by a number of us that that was rather too much power to put in the hands of one man. It was stated at that time that should the Swanson amendment be adopted it would restrain the Secretary from buying a site or erecting a public building thereon until an itemized report had been made to the Congress and the money appropriated by the Congress for that specific purpose. That seemed to me at the time to be a fairly good remedy, as it applied to the right of the Secretary to purchase sites and to construct buildings. It would at least leave in the hands of the Congress control and enable them to approve or disapprove of any purchase of sites, the construction of any building, or the price proposed to be paid for any building.

But there is another power given the Secretary of the Treasury in the bill as just read by the Senator from Mississippi which would not be covered, as I see it, by the Swanson amendment. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell such sites as have already been acquired by the Government, and he is authorized to tear down or to sell such public buildings now owned by the Federal Government as in his opinion are not suitable for the purposes and uses to which they are being put, and to cover into the Treasury the receipts from the sale of these sites and these buildings.

That would confer upon the Secretary the power to sell a site at any price that he might think was justified, and it would confer upon him the power to sell any public building, post-office building, courthouse building, or customhouse building that the Federal Government now owns and cover the money into the Treasury; and under the Swanson amendment the Congress would have no right to interfere with his disposition of these properties at whatever price he might see fit to dispose of them for. I desire to ask the Senator from Maine if I am not correct about that?

Mr. FERNALD. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to ask the Senator what he proposes to do with reference to it, in order that the Congress may have its hands upon this fund, so as to approve or disapprove before the Secretary of the Treasury acts in the sale of a site or in the sale of a building?

We have not heretofore disposed of Government property without Congress having something to say about it. This bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury blanket power to dispose of any building that the Government now owns, anywhere in the United States, if in his judgment it is not quite suited, either as to location or as to construction, for the purposes to which it is dedicated.

Mr. FERNALD. The Secretary of the Treasury doubtless has the authority to sell sites or to exchange property. For instance, in some cities of the United States the Government owns buildings and sites worth at least a million dollars more than it would cost to procure a site and erect a building in a section of the city that would accommodate people better than the present buildings.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Maine at this point?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In nearly every case where a Federal building is located a bitter contest arises as to the selection of the site. The Senator knows that to be the case.

Mr. FERNALD. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does this bill give to the Secretary the power to reopen questions of that character, and to make an exchange of sites?

Mr. SIMMONS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. FERNALD. It does.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Does the Senator think that that authority ought to be unlimited and unrestricted?

Mr. FERNALD. In my opinion, in order to make progress and get ahead rapidly in constructing buildings, instead of coming back to Congress and getting authority, in which case it would be necessary to wait a year, authority should be given the Secretary to make those changes.

Mr. SIMMONS. But, if the Senator will pardon me, he is given this authority with reference to sites that have been purchased and upon which no buildings have been constructed. We all know that in the selection of those sites there is frequently very sharp rivalry and contest. Under this bill the Secretary of the Treasury can reopen all of those contests, can readjust the place where the building is to be erected, and the Congress will have nothing to do with it. He can swap one site for another site, and the Congress will have nothing to do with it. He can exchange one building that the Government owns and is now using for public purposes for some other building, and the Congress has nothing to do with it; or he can tear down an existing building and erect a new building, and the Congress has nothing to do with it; or he can sell a building that is already used by the Government—it may be a building of great value. The Secretary may say, as the Senator now says, that that building at the time it was constructed was possibly in a convenient and suitable place, but conditions have changed in that city, and it is no longer in a suitable place for the purpose; and therefore the Secretary of the Treasury is given authority to sell that building at any price that he and the purchaser may agree upon, and the Congress has no voice in saying whether or not that price is adequate, and whether or not that building ought to have been sold. Does the Senator feel that the Secretary ought to be given these broad powers without any restriction whatsoever?

Mr. FERNALD. I feel that he should. I think it is a business proposition.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well; if the Senator does, then I disagree with the Senator; that is all.

Mr. FERNALD. Yes; that is all. If the Senator desired a post-office building in his State and an exchange of sites, would he want to wait until he could come back to Congress a year from now and then carry it on?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. FERNALD. I prefer to leave it to somebody who can proceed at once.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think it is a great deal better to wait a year before selling a building for what the Congress might consider an inadequate price. The people of this country have waited and are still waiting for public buildings, and where we already have a public building that we are using and that is reasonably meeting the requirements of the situation I think if that building is to be torn down and another site is to be selected, or if it is to be sold, the Congress ought to have the same voice in that matter that we propose to give it in connection with sites that are to be purchased in the future and buildings that are to be hereafter erected.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me just a minute, if the Senator from Maine thinks that it was proper and good public policy to restrain the Secretary's will and discretion with reference to the purchase of sites hereafter or the erection of buildings hereafter, upon what theory or upon what process of reasoning does the Senator object to restraining him from selling sites that have already been purchased by the Government and selling buildings that have already been constructed and are being used by the Government without the

Congress having any voice in fixing the prices or determining the question of sale or change in location?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now? He promised to yield to me.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I yield to the Senator just for a question.

Mr. LENROOT. I desire to ask the Senator whether, in the review that he made of this bill, he considers the words "Secretary of the Treasury" and "Mr. Mellon" as synonymous.

Mr. HARRISON. Well, at least until this administration goes out on the 4th of March, 1929.

Mr. LENROOT. Then the Senator wishes to modify it in that way, because otherwise he would have to assume that Mr. Mellon will continue to be Secretary of the Treasury until at least 1932.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator will get enough promises in the coming fall to do the damage, I am afraid.

Mr. President, it has been shown that there is so much opposition to this public buildings bill, it is such a makeshift, that the time of the Senate should not be taken up with it. There are other measures here that are pressing and should be passed, notably the legislation reported out of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, known as H. R. 7893, to create a division of cooperative marketing in the Department of Agriculture, and so forth, the farmers' relief measure. So I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7893, Order of Business No. 589, and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the bill?

Mr. HARRISON. The bill creating a division of cooperative marketing in the Department of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and called the name of Mr. ASHURST.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FESS. What is the question before the Senate upon which we are voting?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7893.

Mr. FERNALD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the regular order. The roll call has begun, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, as I understand, before the roll commenced to be called I invoked the attention of the Chair.

Mr. SMOOT. Is this a quorum call?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it is a call of the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. No one has answered to the roll call, as I understand.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator has responded to the roll call.

Mr. SWANSON. Then, Mr. President, as no Senator has answered to his name, the point of order that no quorum is present is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; always.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Simmons
Bingham	Gillett	McNary	Smith
Blease	Glass	Mayfield	Smoot
Borah	Goff	Means	Stanfield
Bratton	Gooding	Metcalf	Steak
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Stephens
Bruce	Harrell	Norris	Swanson
Cameron	Harris	Nye	Trammell
Couzens	Harrison	Oddie	Tyson
Cummins	Heflin	Overman	Underwood
Curtis	Howell	Philpps	Wadsworth
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Pine	Walsh
Deneen	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Warren
Dill	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	Watson
Edge	King	Reed, Pa.	Wheeler
Edwards	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Williams
Ernst	Lenroot	Sackett	Willis
Fernald	McKellar	Sheppard	
Ferris	McKinley	Shipstead	
Fess	McLean	Shortridge	

Mr. MAYFIELD. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to proceed to the consideration of House bill 7893.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I simply want to say a word with reference to the motion. The question is debatable.

Mr. HARRISON. I make the point of order that the roll call is in order.

Mr. LENROOT. A matter is debatable after a roll call has been ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the motion is to displace the public buildings bill and to take up the agricultural bill. No Senator need fear for a moment that the agricultural bill will not be taken up and will not be voted upon at this session. As to the public buildings bill, Senators should understand what would be meant by its displacement. In every State—and I can speak particularly of my own State of Wisconsin—there are buildings as to which there is the most urgent necessity of additional appropriations in order to proceed at all. I notice in the list that, fortunately, perhaps, for the Senator from Mississippi, there are only two small cities in his State that would be affected by this bill. But in nearly every other State there are cities which will be affected, where nothing can be done unless some kind of public buildings bill is passed.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator name the places in his State?

Mr. LENROOT. At Madison and Kenosha there is particularly great need because of the remarkable growth of those two cities and where the facilities are utterly inadequate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. Are there not 22 States in this Union, as appeared in the testimony given before the House committee, which will not receive any help at all under the policy to be adopted under this bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Not that I know of.

Mr. OVERMAN. That was stated by a member of the committee on yesterday.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly there was no testimony before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Senate, of which I am a member, to that effect.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not before the Senate committee, but that committee did not have as extensive hearings as were had before the House committee. There are 22 States, one of which is the sixth largest tax-paying State in the Union in which at certain places the buildings have almost fallen down, and yet they are not even mentioned in the list furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury. Twenty-two States are in that category.

Mr. LENROOT. Let me give some information to the Senator from North Carolina upon that subject. I find that there are 10 cities in the Senator's State which would be affected by this bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; under that \$15,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. Where the sites have been bought, and the amount for the buildings authorized. Certainly they can not build under that amount. That is under the \$15,000,000 appropriation. But under the \$100,000,000 there are 22 States that will not be recognized at all.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, it was stated specifically before our committee that there had been no determination of any kind reached as to where these buildings were to be located.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as a further statement I want to say that only yesterday I asked the architect if there was any list, or if they had arrived at any conclusion as to where any of these buildings were to be located, and he said that there had been no conclusion.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to state yesterday that the \$100,000,000 would be spent for emergencies in certain great cities.

Mr. LENROOT. May I say to the Senator from North Carolina, as I said yesterday, in my view there may be just as great an emergency, in proportion, in a small city of 10,000 as there is in a city of 1,000,000 population.

Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. MAYFIELD addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator opened his remarks by saying that there was no doubt whatsoever as to the prospect of the Senate taking up for consideration, and voting upon, so-called farm relief legislation. May I merely supplement that statement of his by saying that the majority of the steering committee, at a meeting yesterday, decided to recommend to the members of the majority that the first bill to follow those already recommended shall be the cooperating marketing bill reported by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and it is the full intention of the majority, at least, to see this farm legislation laid before the Senate in ample time for consideration and to reach a vote.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has just stated that there was no evidence before the Senate committee showing where this \$100,000,000 would be expended. Of course, that is true, because we had no hearings on the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. No formal hearings, but we did have the Acting Supervising Architect before us.

Mr. MAYFIELD. We got together in an informal way and discussed the bill, but the House committee had extended hearings on it. Mr. Wetmore, the Acting Supervising Architect, drew this bill, and if Senators will consult the hearings, a copy of which I hold in my hand, pages 63 and 64, they will find a list of the places which Mr. Wetmore says are the most urgent, and where he says this \$100,000,000 will be expended. That is the old list of two years ago, which has been scaled down and revised to 82 places; and if we add together the amounts set opposite each place in that list, we will see that the total is \$119,650,000, whereas the bill authorizes only \$100,000,000 for those necessitous cases. Therefore \$20,000,000 will have to be lopped off somewhere.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to what the Senator has said, a request was made of the architect to prepare a list of the post-office buildings all over the United States that were inadequate. This is the list that was prepared months and months ago. The architect did not say this \$100,000,000 would be spent on those buildings. He has no right to say that.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Certainly he has no right to say it, but he did say that these are the places which need attention first, and where the first money ought to be expended.

Mr. SMOOT. At the time the survey was made that was true; there is no doubt about it. The architect told me yesterday exactly what that meant. It was made some time ago. There have been changes in the United States to which that would not apply to-day, although at nearly every place mentioned the expenditure of money is necessary, of course.

Mr. MAYFIELD. The Senator says changes have occurred since this list was made. When does the Senator think this list was prepared?

Mr. SMOOT. Some months ago.

Mr. MAYFIELD. It was prepared in January of this year.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that only one post-office building is provided for my State, the amount to be expended being \$675,000.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not what is going to happen.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mine is one of the largest tax-paying States in the Union. We have two places there in which there is an emergency, and yet my State is not mentioned in the list. Will that situation be taken care of?

Mr. SMOOT. Under the Swanson amendment which has been offered and which I have no doubt will be agreed to, all the questions then will be discussed here on the floor before ever an appropriation is made.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no doubt if the Swanson amendment is agreed to it will improve the bill a great deal.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any doubt about it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then there will be a scramble before the Appropriations Committee, of which the Senator from Utah is a member, as to where the buildings shall be located and the amount to be appropriated for them. There will be a wild scramble before our committee, and we will have a fight there every year for six years among the 22 States that are not taken care of now.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. SWANSON. To make the matter clear before the Senate I will state that the bill provides \$15,000,000 to complete authorizations heretofore made and which have been reduced to 65 in number.

Mr. MAYFIELD. No; 82.

Mr. SWANSON. In 1922 the department began to urge the committee to approve a public buildings bill showing the congestion in the country, showing where there were post offices in all the States where business could not be done, where they could not even rent buildings because they did not have money enough, and where there was, as I said, great congestion. They then submitted a list of 140 buildings in 1922 where the congestion existed. Subsequently business grew in the large cities, and they submitted an additional list of 19 buildings where the congestion was so great that the business was interfered with seriously. That was done on the motion of the Post Office Department and the Treasury Department. That made 159 buildings in 1922.

No bill has been passed touching the matter except that some money has been appropriated to relieve some of the congestion. Some bills were passed authorizing appropriations to rent buildings, and possibly some appropriations were made for the purpose of enlarging buildings. Senators will find on page 62 of the hearings that the Supervising Architect was requested to show which of the 159 buildings included in the 1922 list are so congested now that the public business is being interfered with. Some places have been taken care of and the congestion has ceased there. The list found on page 63 is simply a list in response to a request as to which of the 159 buildings are in the same condition to-day that they were in at that time. That is true, is it not?

Mr. MAYFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. SWANSON. That is simply to show where the congestion had been relieved, some by making an enlargement of the building, some by giving more money to rent additional space. The congestion in the 159 buildings as it existed in 1922 has been reduced to 82 buildings; but there is nothing here to show that those buildings can be taken care of. Such a provision is not carried in the bill. That list is simply a list in response to a request as to the condition of the 159 buildings reported in 1922. That is true, is it not?

Mr. MAYFIELD. Yes. In that list are three cities from my State showing urgent need. The Senator tells me that those three cities will be taken care of, while the Senator from Utah says the list means nothing. Now, which is correct?

Mr. SWANSON. I say that it will depend on the Congress. What is presented to the Congress, for instance, is a list of three cities in the Senator's State where the Post Office Department says business is being interfered with, not only in the cities themselves but with reference to the distribution of mail all through Texas. They report here that in the cities of Dallas, Houston, and Fort Worth, Tex., there has been such a congestion of public business that it is seriously interfered with. That is what they say. They do not propose to appropriate any money for the relief of that situation. I would not vote for a bill that appropriated money simply for those places and similar places. The 149 places have been reduced in number to 82, and that is what the department, on its own motion, states comprises the list of cities where business is seriously congested.

In my State they say there are three cities where business is congested, but they make no appropriation for them. I know full well the congestion in my State will not be removed unless we have new buildings. I know the congestion can not be removed in that respect even when this bill is passed. The question that is presented is whether we can get rid of the congestion in these 82 cities, which comprise the cities where business is congested as was set forth in the list which was furnished in 1922.

My amendment provides that no contract shall be entered into by the department until the money is appropriated. It must be appropriated after approval by the Appropriations Committee. If a Senator wants to get a building in Houston or a building in Virginia or a building in North Carolina, an estimate must be made under the Budget system. It then comes to the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee then reports the bill to Congress and Congress has to approve it. The \$100,000,000 is left absolutely at the disposal of future Congresses or this Congress by future action.

I do not see how we are going to get public buildings in any other way unless we have a specific authorization for the specific purpose. I believe it would take a month or two months to do that. All I know is that if the bill does not pass, the congestion in these various States, which has become almost a public scandal in its interference with business, will continue.

Mr. GOODING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. GOODING. In order that my vote may be understood on the pending motion to set aside the bill that is now under consideration and to take up in its stead farm legislation, I wish

to say, as a member of the steering committee, that last evening a place was given to farm legislation to follow the railroad labor bill, which should come up in the next few days. In the meantime, I want to say there is a series of luncheons being held in the District Committee room, two having already been held and one to be held to-day, to which all Senators are being invited, in order that they may listen to a discussion of the needs of farm legislation with reference to the bill which is now on the calendar as reported by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY].

I shall be forced to vote against the present motion of the Senator from Mississippi, because I am sure that a great deal of good is going to be done at these meetings. Farm legislation is being discussed by Mr. Davis, who is well known to most Senators, I think. I make this explanation in order that my vote may be understood when the vote is finally taken on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I want to repeat and emphasize that if the bill does not pass in some form there will be no opportunity whatever for relieving the congestion which exists; there will be no opportunity whatever for securing any appropriation for any public buildings or completing those that have heretofore been authorized. Of course, if Senators wish to be placed in that position, that is their affair.

As I said, the Senator from Mississippi is in a position where he has only two very small cities that are affected, and probably there is no congestion in either of them; but there are at least half of the States of the Union, and I think three-fourths of them, where there is congestion and urgent need for something to be done. What Senators must vote upon is whether we will get some kind of a bill through that will be of some aid, or whether we will do nothing but permit present conditions to continue.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that I trust that the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] will not be sustained. Of course, I know that the Senator feels just as sincere an interest in the welfare of the farmer as I or any other Member of the Senate. But so far as I know his relations to agricultural subjects have not been marked by any such extraordinary degree of zeal as to impel us to believe that his motives in offering his motion are referable solely to an inclination to promote the early enactment of agricultural legislation at this session of Congress. I can only speculate about these motives, and when we enter the field of speculation we very often make some very grave blunders. But I imagine that the motion of the Senator is inspired by his feeling that the improvements which are to be made outside of the District of Columbia under the provisions of the pending bill may be distributed in such a manner as to prejudice the interests of the Democratic Party.

I submit that no such motive as that—and I say it with the utmost deference to the Senator—should be allowed to interfere with the passage of a great measure like this. When we recollect that \$15,000,000 of the amount appropriated by the bill will be used for the completion of local public-building projects throughout the United States, which have been already authorized and are matters of the deepest concern to the people of the different communities in which they are to be carried out, and when we recollect further that \$100,000,000 of the amount appropriated by the bill is also to be used throughout the United States for the erection of Federal buildings, I say that any party, whether it be the Democratic or the Republican Party, would assume a serious responsibility indeed were it to thwart the expenditure of those sums.

I can not conceive of anything better calculated to excite disappointment and resentment throughout the country than the feeling that the motives which have brought about the shipwreck of the pending bill were not motives of a nature to justify such a motion as that of the Senator from Mississippi. Even if the application of the bill were limited to our national territory outside of the District of Columbia, I say that in my humble judgment the motion of the Senator from Mississippi would be untimely, would be injudicious, not only from a public but from a party point of view. However sincere the intention back of it may be, it is, I venture to say, a misconceived motion.

But, Mr. President, the bill has a far greater significance than any mere local significance. The amendment which I have offered to it and which has proved acceptable to the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] as a member of the Public Buildings Commission, and to the Supervising Architect contemplates nothing less than a return to the original plan designed by L'Enfant and supervised by George Washington and Thomas Jefferson for the development of the city of Washington. Over and over again in the past the vision of

that return has presented itself to the imagination of Congress, only later to fade away into nothingness. The consequence is that some 190 buildings have been either constructed, purchased, or rented north of Pennsylvania Avenue without any real reference to considerations of architectural beauty, indeed without reference even to ready intercommunication between the different offices of the Government or other considerations of practical utility; in other words, the public-building growth of this city has been marked to an almost incredible degree by desultory haphazard, ineffective expansion. But we know how strangely great results are often worked out.

All the conditions relating to some project may appear to be hopelessly adverse; years, even generations, may pass without the splendid dream, the radiant thought which inspired it, obtaining fulfillment; and yet a time may come when, through some combination of felicitous circumstances that seems almost fortuitous an opportunity may arise to make that dream a waking reality, and to convert that thought into an actual visible achievement.

In this manner it has come about that the L'Enfant plan for the development of Washington may be realized almost in all the amplitude of its original conception. Seemingly all opposition to it has died down and all indifference to it has been dissipated. Everyone seems to be favorable to it. The whole psychology of the hour seems to prosper it. The idea underlying my amendment is no new one. So far as I am concerned, its conception has not the slightest claim to originality. I have no interest in it except as an American citizen proud of his country and of its Capital, who can see no reason why, when this great country of ours is the wealthiest and most powerful upon the globe, it should not have the most beautiful Capital upon the globe, including a group of public buildings as handsome and imposing as any that ever shed imperishable renown upon ancient Athens or ancient Rome or made modern Paris or Vienna annually the famed resort of thousands of tourists.

The press is favorable to the amendment which I have proposed and has expressed itself in terms of pointed approbation. It has received the approval of more than one architect of distinction. In other words, the time is ripe for its adoption. At last everything is propitious for the resumption of the plan of L'Enfant and Washington and Jefferson.

Great as Washington and Jefferson were in other respects, in nothing did they exhibit more breadth of vision, more liberality of spirit, a more truly cosmopolitan character than in their anticipation of the future growth of Washington, then little more than a straggling village, almost lost in the woods and quagmires. Just as their vision lifted them up above even the crest of the Alleghenies and brought within the range of their foresight the vast possibilities of the boundless and all but unknown West so it was sufficiently exalted to foretell what sort of Capital the scale of our national magnitude would require as time went on.

It was the idea of L'Enfant that this Capitol should stand here where it stands to-day and that no fewer than 16 avenues leading up to it should reveal through beautiful vistas its noble proportions. Then there was to be that superb Mall, 400 feet wide, with a parkway of 600 feet on each side of it, flanked by public edifices stretching away to a point within a few feet of the present Washington Monument; and then from that point leading off to the White House, which was to be placed where it is now situated and in such a manner that no fewer than seven different avenues were to open up vistas to the eye disclosing it as it was approached.

Of all that wonderful plan little in the way of public buildings and their appurtenances exists to-day but this splendid edifice, the White House, and the open spaces of the projected Mall and parkways which happily still remain open though never improved and adorned as originally intended.

As has already been pointed out, the friends of agricultural legislation need have no fear. For one, I pledge my vote now in support of the proposition that it shall be given the right of way over all other kinds of legislation at this session. Such legislation has been maturing for a long time, and now that it is deemed by its sponsors to be almost fully matured, it is entitled to the speediest and the most deliberate consideration. It has already, as the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has pointed out, been placed upon the program of the steering committee of the majority of this body. There is not the slightest likelihood that it will not receive in every respect the measure of attention that it justly deserves. At this moment, as I am speaking, it is not ready for presentation to us, for the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] has just stated to us that a conference with regard to it is going on to-day in the room of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and there is reason to believe that this con-

ference may continue throughout to-day and, for all that I know, for a day or so more. So, in the meantime, let us pass the pending bill. It is my sincere belief that if we could get to a vote upon the amendments it would not be long before it would be passed. Therefore, despite the high degree of respect which I entertain for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I hope sincerely that his motion will not prevail.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

Mr. McNARY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief statement. It is my intention to vote against the motion of the Senator from Mississippi, not that I am particularly interested in the public buildings bill, but I am interested in orderly procedure, and I think the pending bill should be allowed to come to a vote. However, what prompts me to speak is the interest of agriculture. I am thoroughly convinced that the better way is to let agricultural relief legislation take its place on the program. We have contended hard for a place for it; a majority of the Senate has agreed that the question shall be taken up in all seriousness and brought to a vote before the close of the session. Yesterday the Republican steering committee, of which I am a member, put it on the preference list. It is the first of the new bills added to the program. It is my judgment, Mr. President, that those who believe in some sane agricultural legislation which will put the farmer's dollar up to par should vote against the pending motion in order that the bills may take their regular course.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there is much to admire in the very earnest interest of my able and distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], in and his desire to bring about farm-relief legislation at as early a time as possible and in a manner and fashion to do the best for the farmers so far as it can be done by legislation. However, there is no emergency at this time which would justify an effort to set aside the present unfinished business, the public buildings bill, and substitute therefor farm-relief legislation based upon a relief measure which I presented to the Senate a few days ago.

I make that statement in the interest of agriculture. Last week when I proposed certain legislation embodying the report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture I asked for time within which to file a written report. That time was allowed, and on Saturday of last week I was able to submit a report which was published and placed on the desks of Members of the Senate on Monday of this week. Consequently, sufficient time has not been given to Members of the Senate to study this important proposed legislation.

The particular piece of legislation which needs study is contained in the amendment to the main bill, which is designed to create a division of cooperation in the Department of Agriculture. This amendment embraces some of the principles of the old bill known as the McNary-Haugen bill, which was designed to take care of the exportable surpluses in the basic agricultural commodities of the country. It has been much discussed throughout the country.

There have been many modifications of this bill, such as the Dickinson bill, the so-called new Haugen bill, the bill which is sponsored by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Jardine, known as the Tincher bill, all in one way or another embodying the general elements of the old exportable surplus bill, but with modifications and simplifications with which many of us are not conversant.

Beyond that, Mr. President, the House, by a rule made effective a few days ago, decided to give Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of next week to the discussion and consideration of farmer relief measures. One of those measures is similar to the amendment which I have offered to the bill now pending here known as the cooperative bill, one of which has been proposed by Mr. HAUGEN and another by Mr. TINCHER. The other is a part of the cooperative organization bill known as the Curtis-Aswell bill, and embodies some of the features known as the Yoakum plan.

Four days will be given to discussion of these various bills in the House, one of which, or perhaps a mingling of all, will come to the Senate at this session. We will have the advantage of the House discussion, of the best thought of the House; and we will be able to shorten the time necessary for the consideration of farm-relief measures in the Senate if we have the advantage of the discussion and debate that will ensue in the House.

So, Mr. President, any way we may look at it, and particularly in view of the attitude of the House and of the action of the steering committee yesterday fixing a status for this proposed legislation, I think it would be highly imprudent at this

time to attempt to bring out farm-relief legislation when no one is prepared to discuss it. I think that few members of the committee are in position to do so. I feel, after submitting the report, that should we have the advantage of the discussion in the House and their determination as how to approach this great subject under the three plans afforded, we will have something concrete upon which we may work and will be able to shorten the time necessary for a complete consideration in order to give agriculture that relief to which it is entitled.

For that reason alone, Mr. President, I think it would be very unfortunate if at this time we should attempt to consider here a bill for the relief of agriculture which could not properly be presented and which would displace a bill which is much needed in the country. With the assurance of two great committees on agriculture, of the steering committee and of those who are here of a determination to see that agricultural relief shall be provided this year, no one need be affrighted by the suggestion that we are going to adjourn until we enact farm-relief legislation. There are not enough men in the Senate, Mr. President, or in the House who would have the courage, if I may put it in that way, or who would dare to go home and face their constituencies until they had first given an opportunity to this body and the body at the other end of the Capitol to vote upon some kind of farm legislation. For that reason, and for others which I might mention, I sincerely hope that the motion made by the Senator from Mississippi will be defeated.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I am as much in favor of farm-relief legislation, I suppose, as any man in this body. My people are as much interested in it as the people of any other State in the Union. I think what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has said is wisdom. I firmly believe that the Haugen bill is unconstitutional. I do not believe the Government has any right to put a tax on cotton such as that bill provides. Conferences are being held daily on agricultural matters; and in my opinion, if we want to get something done in behalf of agriculture, the best way to do it is to get this public buildings bill out of the way.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] has been extremely courteous. I think he has yielded more to other Senators during the consideration of this bill than all the other Members of the Senate put together have yielded at this session; and in order to bring the matter squarely before the Senate, I move to lay the motion of the Senator from Mississippi on the table.

Mr. HARRISON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. NORRIS. I hope the Senator will withhold that motion for just a moment.

Mr. BLEASE. Certainly.

Mr. HARRISON. I should like to get the yeas and nays ordered on the proposition.

Mr. NORRIS. Wait until it comes up again. I will help the Senator get the yeas and nays then.

Mr. HARRISON. It is perfectly fair that there should be a record vote on this proposition. Will not the Senator permit the yeas and nays to be ordered at this time?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from South Carolina withholds his motion, which he has agreed to do, it is not before the Senate. He can make it at any other time.

Mr. BLEASE. I withdraw the motion.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has made this motion. I think the only effect it can have is perhaps to put in an embarrassing situation some Senators who dislike to vote against the motion because it is a motion to take up one of the things that a great many Senators, at least, are exceedingly anxious to pass.

If it were not known that the bill reported by the Agricultural Committee having in view the relief of agriculture is to be taken up, if it were understood not to be on the program or that any question existed about its being taken up, I should not hesitate to support the Senator's motion; but it is known that the bill is on the program and that it is going to be taken up, and that we are going to dispose of it one way or the other.

At the beginning of the session and later on during the session there was some question about whether that would take place; but those who are opposed to that legislation have conceded that it shall have its place on the program, and the so-called steering committee has put it on the program, and it will follow two other bills that were reported long before that bill was reported and that had been put on the program before this bill was reported from the committee.

As a Senator who has probably listened to more testimony and spent more time on the agricultural question than any other Member of the Senate, I want to say that it seems to me I could not support this motion without, as far as I am con-

cerned, apparently acting in bad faith toward others who do not agree with me on the agricultural situation, but who have laid aside their objection and agreed that this bill shall come up in its proper order, and shall be considered and shall be disposed of. I feel as though I would be breaking faith with them if I did not carry out the existing program, at least until there is some indication that there is bad faith somewhere else; and I do not believe there is.

I am not in favor of this public buildings bill, Mr. President. I expect to vote against it, though not for the reasons that some Senators have given. I am not in favor of the old log-rolling, pork-barrel method of constructing public buildings, and yet at this time I am not in favor of any building bill. I will give my reasons later. But we have gone on with this program, as far as I know, everybody acting with the best of faith. This public buildings bill, backed by a great many Senators who are just as earnest in its advocacy as I am earnest in my desire to do something for agriculture, has been on the calendar since last February. We have been considering it for several days. I hope it will be disposed of soon. It seems to me that it presents a question upon which both sides have a right to be heard and upon which I think we ought to accept the verdict of the Senate. Personally, as I said, I do not expect to vote for it.

To take up at this time the so-called agricultural relief bill that was reported later and is now on the calendar would have a tendency rather to disjoin the proceedings and interfere with the program; and if we are going to jump from one thing to another as we go on we will find that we will not get anywhere. There are many Senators who are honestly opposed to the bill and who will fight it to the best of their ability. If this procedure is to be followed and this bill should now be taken up, it will be followed by similar motions to take up other bills.

Mr. President, as long as those who are opposed to farm-relief legislation will act, as I believe they are now acting in good faith to let us who favor it have it taken up and have a vote on it, I do not believe that we ought to interfere with the program, which, as far as I can see, is fair and square. It seems to me, therefore, that we ought not to stop in the middle of the program and take up something else.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Nebraska for his fairness, which he always shows on all matters that come before the Senate. He and I do not always agree, but I am frank to admit that he is always fair.

I want to say to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE], of whom I have become very fond since he came into the Senate—he and I have been together on very many propositions, fighting the World Court and other matters—that in a spirit of fairness I am going to ask him as a friend to withdraw his motion to table the motion of the Senator from Mississippi, because I feel that it might be confusing, and let the vote come on the main issue.

Mr. BLEASE. I withdraw it.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, there is no occasion for the motion made by the Senator from Mississippi. The Senators who are in favor of the public buildings bill ought to vote to keep it before the Senate. We are not bound to pass the bill in its present form. We can amend it. No legislation can be passed unless it is offered to the Senate for amendment. I know that there is congestion in every State. It is useless to talk about trying to relieve the congestion that is interfering with the transaction of public business all over the United States unless the Senate in an orderly way can dispose of a bill providing for the erection of public buildings.

Every member of the committee reserved the right to offer amendments or to vote for any amendment that was put before the Senate, because we have not had a public buildings bill since 1913, and there is a congestion of business all over the country. There is no use in making excuses to the effect that we hope some day to get rid of this congestion. We have an opportunity to have this bill debated; we have an opportunity to have it amended; we have an opportunity to present to the judgment of the Senate the kind of public buildings we favor. If Senators do not favor the bill in its present form, let them offer their amendments, submit their propositions, and let the Senate discuss them and vote on them. There is no occasion for coming in here and filibustering to prevent a public buildings bill being passed to relieve the great congestion that exists in this country, and which has become so serious that even the various departments of the Government for the last eight years have asked Congress to pass a bill to relieve this congestion in various parts of the country.

I hope, therefore, that the motion of the Senator from Mississippi will not prevail.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I hope we will clearly understand the situation. Members of different committees—not alone the Agricultural Committee, but members of other committees, Senators who are deeply interested in trying to solve, as early as may be, this pressing agricultural problem—are at work on it now. The bill which has been reported is a mere skeleton around which they hope to frame a measure that will meet the situation as nearly as may be.

The bill that has been reported out is perhaps not now in the form in which those who are interested in legislation along this line would agree to it. In my opinion there is no danger of Congress adjourning until some action has been taken in reference to this pressing agricultural problem. I know that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], coming from the State that he does, is just as vitally interested in the proper solution of that question or in a solution that is as nearly correct as we can make it as any other Senator. The solution of this agricultural problem that is before us will not admit of delay without danger.

With that in view, I want to appeal to the Senator from Mississippi not to press his motion to take up for discussion a measure that is not in the form in which we hope to get it when we come to consider it on the floor. Practically all the bills that have been reported are more or less tentative, and we are doing all that we can to get amendments or substitutes that will appeal not only to Congress but to the people at large.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator to say that there is to be a meeting in the near future for the purpose of further considering this bill, and possibly making additional amendments to it?

Mr. SMITH. There will be a meeting called to-morrow, not only of members of the committee but of those who are interested in this problem, to consider the matter seriously in every phase, hoping to get as nearly as may be a correct solution of this acute problem.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, under those circumstances I join the Senator from South Carolina in the expression of the hope that the Senator from Mississippi will withdraw his motion. It will be embarrassing to many Senators to vote against it. I feel, however, that unless better progress is made than we are now making the situation may soon require a motion to displace some of the things that the steering committee of the majority have placed ahead of this farm-relief measure. If this farm-relief measure is not taken up soon, I am going to vote to displace any matter that may be before the Senate by some farm-relief bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think the Senator from North Carolina has expressed the opinion of a majority of Senators on this floor, that when there shall have been worked out a plan favorable to the majority of those who are charged with the duty of framing farm-relief measures, and such a measure shall have been presented to this body they will vote to supplant the balance of the legislation that may not have been acted upon, though reported by the steering committee. It was for that reason that I rose to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he would not withdraw his motion to substitute the agricultural bill for the public buildings bill, because the public at large, the people in general, are very much in earnest about legislation for farm relief, and if the Senator insists on a vote on his motion it will put a good many Senators in a position they can ill justify, in a way. Yet it is perfectly clear to all that we are going to have ample time for the consideration of agricultural legislation before this session of Congress shall adjourn.

As a last word, all I desire to say is that when the committee shall have perfected an agricultural relief bill and brought it before the Senate no interference with its consideration will be tolerated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to take up House bill 7893, the cooperative marketing bill.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I dislike to be found so often in opposition to the majority of my colleagues, but I think this is an opportune time to say that this public buildings bill in its present form will not be passed until after the most strenuous possible opposition.

The theory on which we have acted so many times in recent years has been that if something ought to be done, any measure relating to that subject matter, whether the measure be sound or unsound, must be voted through, and that those who oppose it are opposed to doing anything of a remedial nature. So a bill is brought in that is unsound, and it is forced on until finally the opposition yields.

This public buildings bill proposes to place the expenditure of \$165,000,000 in the hands of a few men who are not members of Congress. Speaking for myself, I will never give my

consent to that kind of a bill. I think it entirely unwise that we have since the war adopted the plan, in the matter of river and harbor improvements, of making a general appropriation and leaving the expenditures to the Chief of Engineers. Congress is by that process yielding to executive officers its right, its prerogative, its duty to determine the character and place of expenditure. This bill seems to be an exaggerated illustration of that rule.

If Chicago needs a new courthouse, that question ought to be passed on by Congress, and the amount to be paid out ought to be fixed by Congress. If New York needs a new public building, the same rule should obtain. That rule should never be varied from.

Mr. MAYFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MAYFIELD. I would like to have the Senator state what, in his opinion, the clause of the Constitution means which says that "Congress shall have power * * * to establish post offices and post roads."

Mr. REED of Missouri. Of course, it means what it says; the language is very clear and plain. But I suppose that Congress has the constitutional right to name an agent and give him a discretionary power as to the particular place where he might locate a post office.

Mr. MAYFIELD. But this measure is an abdication of that power, is it not?

Mr. REED of Missouri. This measure is an abdication of the duty of Congress, in my opinion, for I think it is the duty of Congress, before any considerable sum of money is spent, to itself study the problem and to pass upon it, using its best judgment, instead of transferring the discretionary power to somebody entirely outside of Congress.

Mr. President, we have had enough experience in the last few months to learn something from that experience, if we are capable of learning. We have seen executive officers, without the slightest authority of law except that they have temporarily the control of the purse strings, agree with foreign countries to pay out to them millions of dollars, and when we come to ask those countries to repay—and I speak particularly of Greece—we are confronted with the fact that Greece says, "Your country agreed to loan us \$50,000,000, and she loaned us only \$15,000,000; hence we will not pay back the fifteen million," when the man who signed the agreement to turn over to Greece \$50,000,000 had no more right or authority to do it than any Member of the Senate, or than a justice of the peace at the cross-roads had that right.

We have the spectacle of a commission authorized to go out and settle the debts of foreign countries, and in the bill we passed giving that commission authority, we expressly limited its authority. The commission proceeded to bring us contracts in direct violation of the letter of the statute under which the commission was created, and its settlements have been ratified by the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator means that the law provides that unless we get a certain rate and a certain settlement, then we must come to Congress for consent; and that is what the commission did. If we had settled within the limits of the act, of course, the commission had the power to make the settlement. If the rates were not those provided for, then, of course, the commission had to come to Congress to get the approval of the debt settlement; and there has been no settlement which has not been approved by Congress.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly.

SETTLEMENT OF FRENCH INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, I am not so sure that the Debt Commission had anything to do with it; or am I mistaken about that?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is mistaken about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Newspaper men are wonderful agents for getting facts, and I happen to have in my hand—

Mr. SMOOT. When the facts coincide with what the Senator thinks.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; at all times. I have in my hand a photograph of the negotiators who agreed on the French terms, which appeared in the Washington Post this morning, and I can not find any of the members of the Debt Commission in that photograph except one.

Mr. SMOOT. Senator, that is only a photograph of the men who were there when the agreement was signed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the agreement.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the agreement; but the agreement had really been made and printed and given to the public before the photograph was taken.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think if I had been on the commission, I would not have wanted a composite picture. I see only one

member of the Debt Commission shown in this picture. I think I would have liked to be in the picture. I just extend my sympathy to the Senator from Utah, who was not even allowed to get in the picture.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah could have been there, but the Senator from Utah does not care anything about having his picture in the paper.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that. Apparently the Senator from Utah does not care anything about the settlement, because the settlement was made by one member of the commission, and he gives it out to the papers, of course, and the papers publish the fact. I am sure these newspapers have published the fact. I want to extend my very great sympathy to the Senator from Utah and to the other Republican members of the commission and to my Democratic friends on the commission. They were put on the commission; but you may look at the newspaper report of what occurred, and it does not say a word about either the Democratic or the Republican members of the commission. It refers only to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Mellon, who represented the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator that perhaps the settlement which Congress has approved would not have been effected had it not been for some members of the commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish we had had more members of the commission. Perhaps it would have been a better settlement.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not think the complaint lies in the mouth of the Senator from Tennessee or within the purview of the American Senate. I think the complaint ought to be made from the other side of the ocean that the distinguished figure of the Senator from Utah did not adorn that picture and raise its general average.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would have raised the average. I am frank to say to my friend that I think it would have done so.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Even though the Senator from Utah was not in that picture, he has been given a very distinguished position in the picture the Senate has presented for the last two or three weeks, while the Senate has been canceling the debts of foreign countries to America, a position I am sorry to see him occupy.

Mr. President, the Senator has referred to the act creating the Debt Commission. Let me read it:

Be it enacted, etc., That a World War Foreign Debt Commission is hereby created, consisting of five members, one of whom shall be the Secretary of the Treasury—

It ought to have read "all of whom shall be the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is wrong.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I continue reading:

who shall serve as chairman, and four of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Notice this language:

SEC. 2. That, subject to the approval of the President, the commission created by section 1 is hereby authorized to refund or convert, and to extend the time of payment of the principal or the interest, or both, of any obligation of any foreign Government now held by the United States of America, or any obligation of any foreign Government hereafter received by the United States of America (including obligations held by the United States Grain Corporation, the War Department, the Navy Department, or the American Relief Administration), arising out of the World War, into bonds or other obligations of such foreign Governments in substitution for the bonds or other obligations of such Government now or hereafter held by the United States of America, in such form and of such terms, conditions, date or dates of maturity, and rate or rates of interest, and with such security, if any, as shall be deemed for the best interests of the United States of America: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize or empower the commission to extend the time of maturity of any such bonds or other obligations due the United States of America by any foreign Government beyond June 15, 1947, or to fix the rate of interest at less than 4¼ per cent per annum: *Provided further*, That when the bond or other obligation of any such Government has been refunded or converted as herein provided, the authority of the commission over such refunded or converted bond or other obligation shall cease.

SEC. 3. That this act shall not be construed to authorize the exchange of bonds or other obligations of any foreign Government for those of any other foreign Government, or cancellation of any part of such indebtedness except through payment thereof.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the Senator will agree that that is about what I stated, that the commission had power only to make settlements according to the law; and if there

were any better or different settlements than those provided by law, they had to come to Congress and have the approval of Congress.

Mr. REED of Missouri. They would have to have a new authority.

Mr. SMOOT. That is why we came here. If the debt had been settled according to the law, we would not have had to come here. We would have had to have the signature of the President then, and that is all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understand. Now let us look at this authority. Here was a commission created with a specific power to be exercised under specific limitations. What was its business and its only business? What was it called into existence to do? It was to go to these other countries and refund the debts, dollar for dollar, to take such security as it might be able to get, to fix a date of maturity not later than 1947, and to collect not less than 4¼ per cent interest. That is all the business it had. If it could not perform that business, it was not authorized to make some other contract or agree upon some other terms and then come back here and ask Congress to ratify those terms.

It was its business to go to the gentlemen representing the foreign countries and say, "Here is our commission of authority. We can only do this. We can extend the time of your payments; we can take security; but your obligations which you give us in lieu of those we now hold must be equal in amount with those which we are about to surrender. They must bear 4¼ per cent interest. This is the warrant of our authority. We were created for no other purpose. We have no other business. We were not created to negotiate anything but these limited matters of time of payment and security."

When they went outside of that authority they were mere interlopers; they were assuming a right to negotiate that never was given them; they were assuming in a sense to morally bind this country when they had not been authorized to do a single thing of that kind. There is no clause here—

Mr. SMOOT. There is no moral obligation, because every country understood, and the representatives of every country understood, that not only did Congress have to agree to the settlement, but their own country would have to agree to it before the contract could be executed. That has been the case in every settlement.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I understand all that. There is no clause in the act which said something like this: "*Provided further*, That if the commission can not settle upon the terms aforesaid, they shall then secure such proposition of settlement as they may be able to secure and report that settlement to Congress." The intent of Congress was to say to those foreign nations, "This is the mark Congress fixes. This commission has no business outside of the bounds and limits we have fixed. We send them to you to negotiate this kind of a settlement and they have no business to talk about any other kind of a settlement."

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure the Senator would never have supported a proviso of that kind.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; I would not.

Mr. SMOOT. Nor would I. That would have been simply an invitation to all countries beforehand to understand that they need not settle upon the original terms, but that America expected them to get whatever terms they wanted.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator fortifies my argument. Congress did not intend to give the commission any such authority. Congress not only would not write it in the bill, but by its exclusion from the bill Congress in effect said to the commission, "You have no right, sirs, to begin negotiating on any other basis than that. You are the agents and that is all, and Congress does not authorize you to make any other kind of a settlement. You are our agents to present our demands, and there your authority ceases."

Mr. SMOOT. Congress has had the right to say, "We will not agree to the settlement that was made."

Mr. REED of Missouri. What the commission did was to go outside of the authority that was granted to them, entirely outside of it. The Senator said to me a moment ago upon the floor of the Senate that he did not think Congress would put in the law a clause giving the commission the right to negotiate outside the terms of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That would have been simply notice to all foreign countries—not that it would have made any difference at all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If Congress would not give the commission the right, why did the commission usurp the right?

Mr. SMOOT. We have not usurped any right at all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Why did the commission presume to do it?

Mr. SMOOT. We made a settlement and we came to Congress and said, "Will you agree to this settlement?" All Congress has to do is to say "no," and that would end it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The commission made a settlement. That is just what they did. They made a settlement. The Senator said that the Congress would not have written in the act the power or authority for the commission to make that settlement, but he went on and made the settlement in defiance of the will of Congress, and he made it as a settlement without any authority on earth. Having in that way involved our country, he comes back to the Senate and says, "We are your commission. You appointed us to do one thing. We have done an entirely different thing. Yet we are your commission to do that which you never authorized us as a commission to do." The Senator had no more right to make this agreement than I have the right to go out and make it. There was nothing written in the law authorizing him to make it, to talk about it, to negotiate it. He was appointed for a specific purpose, and when he went outside that purpose he went as denuded of authority and of right as any Member of the Senate, as any citizen of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. That would be true if it were binding upon the United States or any foreign country, but it was not binding on Congress, nor was it binding on any foreign country until Congress and the similar authority in the foreign country had agreed to the proposition.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator from Utah is correct in his construction of the statute, it is eminently unfair to proceed along the line of argument which we had when the Italian debt settlement was before the Senate, because the argument made was that our commission had made a settlement and that we could not afford to reject the judgment of our commission.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not say that I made any such statement. I never made it, I did not believe it, and I do not believe it now. I am quite sure it is not possible.

Mr. BORAH. Then let us understand that when we are discussing the French settlement we will have no argument to the effect that we must not reject the proceedings of our commission. The fact is that they have acted wholly outside of the statute. That will be conceded. It will have no binding effect until the Congress acts upon it. If the Congress is to act upon it de novo, we ought not to be confronted with the argument that we are overturning an authorized commission.

Mr. SMOOT. If the French settlement or any other settlement had been made according to the terms of the act, the commission would not have had to come back to Congress for its approval. All that we would have required would have been an agreement upon the terms provided in the act and then the signature of the President. Congress would have had nothing whatever to do with it. The only reason why the commission came back to Congress was because under the act itself there was no authority to make other terms of settlement. That happened with Great Britain, the first one we settled with, and with every settlement made up to this time.

Mr. BORAH. I would suggest that it is true, as I understand, that the commission acted wholly outside of its authority under the statute. The only thing that we have before us now is a mere suggestion upon the part of the commission for our consideration. We are considering it aside from the prestige and binding effect of an authorized commission.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, let us follow this line of thought a moment. I appoint an agent to go and buy a cow. I tell him how much he shall pay for the cow. The individual whom I appoint as an agent to buy a cow for me, and who is my agent for that purpose alone, goes out and agrees to buy a farm. Then he comes back to me and says, "As your agent I have agreed to buy this farm, and now you ought to take it." What would the Senator say about that sort of an agent?

But the case here is much stronger than that, and I do not propose to let anybody get away from the main fact if I can help it. Congress knew that there was an agitation in foreign countries to repudiate or cut down their indebtedness; that there was an agitation in foreign countries to cut down the interest upon their indebtedness. With that knowledge, Congress enacted a law. Congress wanted to put an end to any such contention on the part of any foreign nation and to serve notice upon all of them that if they settled their debts and obtained the benefit of the extension of time, they must give their obligations for the full amount they owed the United States with interest at $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. The debates of that time

will bear out the statement I have just made and will clearly show this to have been the expressed purpose of Congress.

Therefore we picked out five men. We said to them, "Here is the commission which is your warrant of authority; so long as you act in pursuance of the authority we have granted, you are a commission for that purpose, and that purpose only." When the commission went outside of that authority, it no longer was a commission; it no longer had any warrant of authority; it was the case of five individuals presuming on their own authority and in their own right to sit down and negotiate in the name of the United States a contract which the commission was never authorized even to talk about. It is a piece of superlative insolence. It is so devoid of all common decency that similar conduct would bring a blush of shame to the brazen cheek of a first-class orthodox devil. I am astounded to find men commissioned by the Congress of the United States to do a certain thing having the temerity to do an entirely different and wholly unauthorized act, and then seek to excuse it by saying, "Well, we brought back this thing we were not authorized to do at all, but which we agreed upon in so far as we could bind the United States, and now you must accept it, because we were your commissioners." They were our commissioners for one thing and they did another thing, and then and thereupon they ceased to be our commissioners.

There has never been a man authorized to represent the United States yet who has sat down and even talked these matters over, because the Senator from Utah and his associates on the commission were without authority. They had no more right, I repeat, to enter upon these negotiations than five Senators about me had the right to proceed with such negotiations. I have the right to go out unauthorized and negotiate; that is a simple right that I might assume; but I would bind nobody. The Debt Commission had exactly the same kind of right when they went outside the bounds and limits and measures that Congress had staked out to confine their authority. This is an old illustration of the fact that whenever you give authority of any kind to human beings you may count on those human beings usurping other authority and doing other acts. Yet Senators come in here and say—and it has been said not once but many times; it has been the spinal column of the argument produced in favor of these debt-settlement measures—that a duly authorized commission acting within the purview of its authority had sat down and made the best bargain it could make, and that representing this Government it had agreed to the settlements in so far as it was possible for a commission to agree; hence, having thus proceeded and bound our Government, it is the duty of Congress to ratify the agreements.

It is a monstrous proposition. I might as well go out tomorrow and promise somebody that the United States Senate will do a certain thing. As long as I sit in my seat and act within the limits the Constitution has fixed to my authority I have the right to bind by my vote, as far as my vote goes, the people of the United States, but when I go a hair's breadth beyond the bounds of my authority, I am a private citizen, and if I seek to bind my Government I am an usurper or an attempted usurper.

Mr. President, I did not intend to say a word about this matter to-day, but as I have read and reread this warrant of authority which we issued my indignation has been rising until I find it impossible to restrain speech.

Why did members of the commission not come back here and say, "These nations refuse these terms, and we, on the part of the United States, have rejected their propositions, because they do not come within the limits Congress fixed"; and then let Congress proceed to act upon the question as its wisdom might dictate? They did not do that. They said, "This rope is long enough so that we can wander at large; we will make a contract and bring it back and then let us see what Congress will do in refusing to ratify our act." Senators have stood here and argued day after day that the commission had acted. The commission did not act, for the commission was never created for the purpose of any such action. We have the instance of five gentlemen proceeding in their own right, and in no other right, and assuming to represent the United States in these negotiations, when they were utterly without authority to represent the United States in the way that they pretended to represent them.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do.

Mr. FRAZIER. I wish to ask the Senator if, according to press reports of this morning, the French debt settlement

has not already been signed and agreed to and that it is practically up to the Senate to adopt it?

Mr. REED of Missouri. So we are told; and I recall only two days ago, when the press stated that the French settlement had been agreed upon, my friend from Utah [Mr. Smoot] rose in his seat, and, as I remember, said there had been no agreement whatever.

Mr. SMOOT. And there had not been.

Mr. REED of Missouri. And we were led to believe there had not been any negotiations that had brought matters to a head, and yet in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, after the ratification of the Belgian debt settlement, it appears that the entire proposition has been agreed upon.

Mr. SMOOT. There have been a good many meetings since then.

Mr. REED of Missouri. How many meetings could there have been in the last 24 hours?

Mr. SMOOT. It is not a question of 24 hours.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator mean to tell us now that this question of the French debt settlement was an open question—

Mr. SMOOT. I certainly do.

Mr. REED of Missouri. And that within a few hours of time the Debt Commission suddenly agreed upon the settlement of a \$4,000,000,000 claim; that that all happened in a few moments; that it was not substantially agreed upon before?

Mr. SMOOT. No; it was not agreed upon before.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Was it not substantially agreed upon?

Mr. SMOOT. I think there is a great deal of difference between the French offer and what has now been agreed upon.

Mr. REED of Missouri. When did they change their offer to that which we now have—at what hour of the day and what day?

Mr. KING. Or what hour of the night?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; or of the night?

Mr. SMOOT. I know as far back as Monday we held a meeting and there was no agreement reached at that meeting.

Mr. REED of Missouri. How near were you to a meeting of minds?

Mr. SMOOT. There was an insistence upon a security clause at the time and the payments were very much less than as provided for in the agreement subsequently reached.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Had not that all been talked over and had not the French substantially agreed that they were going to yield upon it?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President, they had not; and the French did not know what the outcome would be until—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Then what was the miraculous thing that changed their mind so quickly?

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say, so far as I am concerned, that I would not agree to the proposition, and so stated at the meeting of the commission. The French ambassador could not consent to the agreement that has since been reached, but had to cable to his Government before ever he could agree to it. He came over here with a proposal which he said he was authorized to make, but it was quite a different proposal from the agreement which has been reached.

Mr. McKELLAR. When was the last meeting of the commission; yesterday?

Mr. SMOOT. We had a meeting yesterday, when the agreement was finally reached.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Where and how long did it take?

Mr. SMOOT. On yesterday the meeting did not occupy as long a time as the preceding meeting.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That does not help us any. How long did it take? We do not know how long the other meetings were.

Mr. SMOOT. Yesterday it did not take very long, because we had made a proposition to the French representative and told him exactly what we would do and what we would not do. That was cabled to the French Government, and the French Government yesterday cabled to the French ambassador here, so that all the ambassador had to do was to say that he was authorized to make the settlement.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Still I want to know how long this interesting meeting lasted when the Debt Commission settled an indebtedness of \$4,000,000,000?

Mr. SMOOT. We have had three or four meetings, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am asking about the last one. How long did the last one take?

Mr. SMOOT. I think we met at 9.30 o'clock in the morning at the last meeting and got out some time in the afternoon.

Mr. REED of Missouri. When was that meeting held?

Mr. SMOOT. The last meeting at which we made a proposition was on Monday, April 26.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am asking about the last meeting which the commission held.

Mr. SMOOT. That was on yesterday.

Mr. REED of Missouri. How long did that meeting last?

Mr. SMOOT. Just long enough for the French ambassador to say that he accepted the proposition we made.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Where was that meeting held?

Mr. SMOOT. In the Treasury Department.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator did not tell us when we were discussing this question the other day that the American commission had made a definite proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. We had not made it at that time.

Mr. REED of Missouri. When was the meeting at which the proposition was made?

Mr. SMOOT. It was on the 26th of April.

Mr. REED of Missouri. And we have been debating this question since the 26th of April.

Mr. SMOOT. The question of the French settlement arose here when we were discussing either the Italian or the Belgian debt settlement bill—for the moment I forget which—and that was before April 26.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The debate has been proceeding every day here. We have been debating this question every day.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can try to impeach my word here if he wishes—

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am not trying to impeach the Senator's word; I am merely trying to have the specific facts.

Mr. SMOOT. I have given the Senator the specific facts, and he is not satisfied.

Mr. REED of Missouri. No; the Senator has not been very specific.

Mr. SMOOT. Monday was April 26, was it not?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Monday was the day the final offer was made by the American commission to the French ambassador.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the Senator never told the Senate that when we were discussing the other debt settlement bills.

Mr. SMOOT. Because of the fact that the question has not come up since Monday. I did not know whether the French Government would accept it or not, and no one else knew; but yesterday the French ambassador received a cablegram, and we were called together yesterday afternoon.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Now, is not this a fair statement of the case—

Mr. SMOOT. It is not fair unless it is exactly in accord with the facts as they exist. I have told the Senator the facts.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Wait until I make my statement before the Senator repudiates it as unfair. Is not this a fair statement of the case: That two or three days ago a newspaper article was produced here saying that a settlement of the French debt had been agreed upon?

Mr. SMOOT. That was before the 26th of April.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well—and that that statement was repudiated by the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator to get the RECORD now and see whether the newspaper report as to the settlement of the French debt is the same as the settlement which has since been made. That newspaper report stated that the first yearly payment was \$25,000,000, while under the settlement it is \$30,000,000; that report said that the largest annual payment would be \$100,000,000, while the settlement provides that the largest payment shall be \$125,000,000; that newspaper report said that there was a security clause in the agreement, while in the settlement made there is no security clause whatever.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Yes; but the point is that when that article was read here it was denied that there was any settlement.

Mr. SMOOT. And there had been no settlement.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well. Now, how many times subsequently to that on the floor was the charge made that a settlement had been substantially agreed upon, and how often were we given to understand that the French debt was still a matter that had not been settled and that nobody knew how it would ultimately be settled?

Mr. SMOOT. Whenever I made the statement, Mr. President, it was absolutely true. The final proposition was made, as I say, on Monday, April 26, and I have a record of it here, and I can read it to the Senator if he desires. From that time until yesterday there was no word from France, and the ambassador had no authority to say that they would accept it until yesterday, and he gave notice yesterday.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But the ambassador and the American representatives of themselves had agreed upon a proposition, provided the ambassador could get authority from his country to accept it.

Mr. SMOOT. He could not agree. He said he would present that proposition to his government.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly; but he could agree just as much as you could.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Each of the two sides had to go back to a primal authority, and you had agreed on your part that you would ratify a settlement of a certain character, and he had agreed on his part that he would ratify it, provided in each case you could get authority from your principals to make that kind of a settlement.

Mr. SMOOT. That is true.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, no such statement as that has been made to the Senate before. We were all given to understand that this French debt settlement was up in the air.

Mr. SMOOT. It was.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We did not know whether we would ever get a settlement or not. There have been more secret negotiations going on in this matter than were condemned by Woodrow Wilson in all the denunciations that he ever made of all the secret treaties of all the ages that are past. We have had nothing but secret negotiations, and secrets have been kept even from this body.

Mr. President, I want to serye notice now that as far as I am concerned I expect the Finance Committee to examine every paper and every document and every bit of correspondence relating to the French debt, and the minutes, if there are minutes, of every meeting, and to report here, so that we may know what these negotiations have been, and that until that is done I think there will be some difficulty in ratifying this French debt settlement.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a moment?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from Utah give us assurance as the chairman of the Finance Committee, that he will cooperate with those Members who desire to make a thorough investigation into this problem in getting all the papers and all the facts and letting the matter stay in the committee until they do get the facts, and get such facts that the committee can compare the capacity of Italy to pay with that of France, so that we may know what reasons prompted a settlement on the basis of 26 cents on the dollar with Italy and on the basis of 50 cents on the dollar with France? Will the Senator allow us to investigate the settlement with Czechoslovakia and the conditions over there and her ability to pay, so that we can understand and get the reason why the commission permitted Italy to pay us only 26 cents on the dollar and Czechoslovakia 82 cents on the dollar?

Mr. SMOOT. That will be entirely in the hands of the committee, Mr. President.

Mr. HARRISON. What will be the chairman's position?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection whatever to asking the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish everything affecting the French debt settlement.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator wants to ask the Secretary of the Treasury. It looks as though the Senator can not get anybody in his head except the Secretary of the Treasury. If, in order to get the facts, it is necessary to go beyond the Secretary of the Treasury, will not the Senator cooperate with us?

Mr. SMOOT. When we get into the committee the committee will decide that question.

Mr. HARRISON. But the Senator has not told me or the Senator from Missouri whether he will cooperate with us in the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know what the Senator means by "cooperate." I am not going to cooperate in any way to hold up this settlement until after the adjournment of Congress. I will say that.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the Senator that I do not think there will be any desire upon the part of anybody to hold the matter in the committee longer than is required to get the facts.

Mr. SMOOT. It is better for me to make no promises, Mr. President. When we get in the committee the committee can say what it wants to do.

Mr. HARRISON. The reason why I asked the Senator the question is this: Here is the debt settlement on the table. It has been referred to-day to the committee. We can ask for reconsideration of that action and ask that instructions be issued to the committee to follow out a certain line of investi-

gation. Of course, there is no need for that if the Senator will cooperate with us in trying to give us all the facts.

Mr. SMOOT. All I say is that I do not think there is any question but that the Treasury Department will furnish all the information they have regarding the matter, as well as the Commerce Department and the State Department.

Mr. SIMMONS. But, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the Senator from Utah does not mean that he would insist upon restricting the investigation to such information as we may get from the Secretary of the Treasury, does he? Here is a settlement involving \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Four billions.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Government surrenders two billions, one-half of its debt. That settlement is reported to the Senate. It is referred to the Finance Committee for its consideration and investigation; and the Senator, as chairman of the committee, certainly would not insist here on the floor of the Senate upon restricting the investigation by the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator wants anybody to come before the committee and give evidence, I do not think any member of the committee will object to it.

Mr. SIMMONS. It may be that the minority would be entirely satisfied with the testimony that might be obtained through the Treasury Department, and it may be that it would not be so satisfied; and an investigation of this sort, to advise the Senate with reference to a transaction of this amount, certainly ought not to be restricted in any way whatever. Of course, nobody would want to prolong the discussion unnecessarily. I think the Senator from Utah will agree that the minority Senators have not shown any such disposition as that; but there ought to be a thorough investigation of this matter.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that the chairman of the committee has in no way, shape, or form ever undertaken to restrict the hearings.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not say that he has; but the Senator has given utterance to some views here that indicate that he is not willing that the committee should investigate, except to get information through the Treasury Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no!

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Senator probably spoke rather hastily about that.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do.

Mr. HARRISON. I desire to ask the Senator from Utah, in speaking of that meeting this morning, whether all of the members of the American commission were present?

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator mean yesterday afternoon?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; when the final touches were put upon the French debt settlement.

Mr. SMOOT. They were all present with the exception, I think, of Secretary Hoover.

Mr. HARRISON. Was Secretary Kellogg present?

Mr. SMOOT. Secretary Kellogg did not stop there. He had to leave.

Mr. HARRISON. He just passed by? It was a sort of flag station?

Mr. SMOOT. He had to leave; but I will say to the Senator that all the other members were there except Secretary Hoover.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I do.

Mr. KING. I want to express my amazement at the suggestion made by the Senator from Mississippi that Secretary Mellon could not and would not furnish all the information desired upon all subjects relating to the Government. The Senator ought to know that in the primary election which is now being conducted in Pennsylvania the cry has been shifted which was the slogan in the last Republican campaign, "Stand by Coolidge!" And the cry now is, "Stand by Mellon!" Mellon seems to be the head and front of the administration, and the guide and director of the administration. He, without any authority or suggestion from Congress, prepared a bill to dispose of our debts to and from Germany, and he has directed these negotiations; and there can be a change of front overnight, and Mr. Mellon can agree upon the French debt or any other debt without consultation with the commission or with Congress. The Senator from Mississippi seems to have lost sight of the powerful figure which to-day is dominating the Republican Party.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I have in my hand the Washington Times of this afternoon, and my eye caught this article while this interesting discussion has been going on. I want to read it:

PARIS, April 30.—The French cabinet met to-day and definitely approved the debt settlement reached in Washington.

The cabinet studied the terms of the agreement which Ambassador Berenger signed, and though it is reported that there was some criticism of it, it was learned that the cabinet gave its approval to the accord.

Raoul Peret, French Minister of Finance, however, described the settlement report from Washington as "premature."

Peret indicated the possibility even yet of sending new instructions to Ambassador Berenger, who had acted for France in the debt negotiations with the United States.

It was reported in well-informed circles that Berenger exceeded his instructions.

"Such figures would certainly have been called astronomical by the Anglo-Saxon press if imposed upon vanquished Germany," the nationalist organ, *Gaulois*, said to-day. "No person of good sense on either side of the Atlantic can believe that such a Draconian agreement will be supported by six generations of Frenchmen."

In other words, they intend to repudiate it hereafter.

L'Action Francaise, the royalist newspaper, published the reports under a headline reading, "Agreement reached, and what an agreement!"

Mr. SMOOT. They are all opposed to it.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I started to talk about the public buildings bill, and the fact that it proposed to vest the authority not in Congress but in those outside of Congress to expend this large sum of money; and that led to a discussion of this question, as illustrative of the fact that gentlemen clothed with a little brief authority are quite willing to extend it in accordance with their own ambitions and wishes. The article I have just read throws some light upon the attitude of France. So far as I am concerned, and going back now to the public buildings bill, that bill might as well go back to a committee and have written into it the necessary clauses retaining for Congress the right to control the disposition of this money; otherwise, it is going to have a rather rocky road to travel.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am not going to detain the Senate more than a moment. I presume when this matter comes before the Committee on Finance the real problem will be to determine France's capacity to pay. I take it that this settlement was based upon that principle, the same as the Italian settlement and the other settlements we have disposed of. It seems to me, Mr. President, that we have confined our investigations to too narrow a sphere in determining this question of capacity to pay.

I ask the members of the committee to give some attention to an article which lately appeared in the *English Review*, written by the former Premier of France, M. Caillaux. In discussing France's present financial condition, and her ability or capacity to meet her debts, he has some suggestions to make which, it seems to me, are worthy of our consideration and investigation. This article appears in the *English Review* of February 26, and I quote a paragraph or two:

To understand how France has reached the delicate situation—I will not put it more strongly than that—in which she finds herself, one must bear in mind the defects of one of the greatest qualities of the Gallic race. The extraordinary ability of the Frenchman to save has been justly praised; but people have failed to notice that this very hunger for economy renders him who is affected by it so careful of his private interests that he is tempted to ignore the interests of the State.

The financial and economic history of France bears witness to the coexistence of an uninterrupted process of private saving with a tendency toward carelessness in the administration of the funds of the community.

The old monarchy of France was never able to free itself from its perennial financial embarrassments save by the abuse of the rights of its creditors.

The efforts of the statesmen of the Republic who favored a serious effort to amortize the debt met with stubborn opposition. It would be necessary, whispered the public, to increase taxation to the detriment of private incomes. What was the use of that? Let things continue as they were. The future would take care of itself. A counsel of weakness which, nevertheless, had the support of the public.

The French people, not having formed in peace time the habit of financial self-sacrifice, allowed themselves to be easily persuaded by the men at the head (who lacked the courage to tell them the brutal truth) that, to meet the cost of the war, it would be sufficient to borrow, that taxes would be increased, if it were necessary later on.

A vast indebtedness was thus piled up—the French debt grew from thirty milliards to five hundred and fifty milliards of francs—without its service being guaranteed by a corresponding increase of taxation.

Even then the situation would not have been so serious if, at the end of the war, the simple, but energetic decision necessary to the

situation had been taken. Unfortunately, the country was merely provided with a formula which it was pleased to use as "eye wash": "Germany will pay."

Why, then, submit to heavy taxation? Were not our enemies under the obligation to meet the expenses of the reconstruction of the liberated districts of France? Were they not obliged—thanks to the intervention of the British negotiators at the peace treaty—to assume the payment of pensions to the victims of the war? Thus were two categories of payments—and important categories—eliminated. One could afford to borrow to repair the ruins wrought by the cataclysm and to pay for the damage caused to the people and to their possessions. There was nothing inconvenient in that. Germany would repay. She was going to make over colossal sums. Mr. Lloyd-George like Mr. Klotz, Lord Cunliffe like M. Loucheur, had guaranteed it. The German payments, according to these gentlemen, would be so huge that there was no need to bother about expense. From beyond the Rhine showers of gold would fall over France.

This is the ex-Premier of France writing:

Thus, caught in a snare of childish optimism, the nation paid little or no attention to the growth of a public debt which doubled in the postwar period between 1919 to 1924. From one hundred and fifty milliards it went to three hundred milliards of francs.

What he says is that the present financial plight of France is due to the fact that never in her history, and particularly since the beginning of the war, or since the war, have they been willing to lay the taxes upon their people which they should have justly laid under all the circumstances. Then on page 168 he says:

First of all, there is the debt. It amounts to three hundred milliards of francs—a terrifying total. But it must not be forgotten that it is a question of paper francs. In gold francs it is only sixty milliards; that is to say, to only twice the pre-war debt.

State bankruptcy, you will say. An insidious bankruptcy, brought on by the establishment of a fictitious relationship between paper money and gold money. That may be so. One can not deny what is evident. On the other hand, it is useless to ignore the fact that when great tempests fall upon a people there must be victims. To save the nation, one must resign oneself to individual suffering, when a long series of mistakes have caused such suffering to be inevitable.

Then, Professor Sarolea, writing upon the same subject, says:

The causes of the collapse of the franc are not economic, and the collapse could easily have been avoided.

Indeed, if the problems of the franc had been mainly economic, it would have been solved long ago. For France is by no means ruined. So far from being ruined, the peasant class, who are still the majority of the French nation, are more prosperous than they ever were before the war. They have been able to buy up millions of acres. Hundreds of thousands of petty farmers have recently become peasant proprietors. Their standard of living has enormously improved. On any market day in any important agricultural town you may witness a strange spectacle, which before the war would have been undreamed of—the spectacle, namely, of scores of farmers coming to the market place in their motor cars.

In view of this abounding prosperity, why has it been impossible for the French Minister of Finance to extract from a thriving peasant class an amount of taxation sufficient to balance the national budget? The reasons are, each one of them, political and moral.

I do not read it all, but pass over some parts, because I trust those who are interested in the subject will have time to read it all.

1. In the first place, the whole fiscal policy of successive French Governments since the armistice has been deflected by the golden mirage, and has been dominated by the sinister delusion, of the German indemnity—a delusion which I may claim to have been the first European publicist to denounce six years ago in the columns of the "*Scotsman*." That delusion has been an insuperable obstacle to any sound financial policy. Why should the French Government have troubled to put order in their finances, when the Germans were going to pay the bill? The most extravagant expenditure, the most criminal speculations and speculations were met with the cynical reply: "C'est le boche qui paiera!"

2. In the second place, an agricultural community is temperamentally much more refractory to taxation than an industrial community. Such has been the case in Poland and in Germany, such was the case in Imperial Rome, when the whole burden of taxation fell on the "curiales," or middle class. Such was also the case under the old French monarchy. For the difficulties of the French tax gatherer are not of to-day. Even in the palmy days of the monarchy a despotic government found it so difficult to collect its taxes that it had to intrust the impossible task to a special class of money lenders.

The French peasant has indeed an infinite capacity of thrift. But he will not save in order to pay his taxes; he will only save in order to buy a cow or a piece of land.

4. In the fourth place no French Government is either strong enough or stable enough to enforce unpopular measures. French parties are too divided, and political majorities are too uncertain. Even if the majorities were large and if the Government were strong, such a strong Government would still have to depend on the votes of the peasants. Even then it could not afford to alienate its constituencies. No democratic government is prepared to commit political suicide.

We have required into the main causes of the collapse of the France and of the financial troubles of the French Government, and we have proved that those causes are obviously political and moral rather than economic.

Mr. President, I presume we are all agreed—at least it can be well established—that France at the present time is the most prosperous nation in Europe and has been enjoying that prosperity for the last three or four years. If we are in a position where we are unable to collect more than 50 cents on the dollar, it is due to the fact that the French citizen has refused to pay taxes in accordance with the obligations which rested upon him, in view of the condition, financial and economic, which confronted his country. The American taxpayer is to take care of the taxes which the French citizens refuse to pay. That is established from the lips and out of the mouth of the ex-Premier of France himself.

AFFAIRS ON THE MEXICAN BORDER

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I offered a resolution which was referred to the Committee on Immigration, calling for an investigation of the conduct of immigration officials and agents along the Mexican border. The resolution particularly asked for an investigation in regard to the murder of General Torres and the connection of the immigration officials therewith. I denounced the death of Torres as a cowardly murder, and, in effect, that either the immigration officials in Washington or the immigration agents upon the Mexican border were in part responsible for his death.

Before briefly referring to the subject matter of the resolution, I desire to make an observation growing out of the criticisms appearing from time to time in various newspapers of the action of Congress in conducting investigations of executive departments and agencies and of various officials of the Government.

Undoubtedly there is not a little resentment upon the part of some executive officials and some executive agencies because Congress has had the courage, in the discharge of an imperative duty, to institute a number of investigations. In my opinion, Congress has been derelict in not instituting more investigations and in not more carefully scrutinizing the conduct of executive officials and instrumentalities. Bureaucracy in every country and in every age has tended toward maladministration, inefficiency, and oftentimes corruption. Executive and administrative bureaus, agencies, and officials have always been inclined—and it is human nature—to usurp authority and to arrogate to themselves a status of superiority and power, which is against the best interests of the people and constitutes an insidious but powerful attack upon the Government itself. And every student of our Government, particularly during the past 25 years, must reach the conclusion that the malady which has afflicted executive officials and agencies in the past, and in other Governments, affects to-day this Nation and the bureaus and officials of executive departments.

I only repeat when I say that it is the history of ages that executive departments become autocratic. They incline to absolutism and impinge upon the rights of individuals as well as upon the rights of local self-government. The attention of Congress and of the country is often challenged to the intolerant, autocratic, capricious, and oftentimes illegal course of bureaus and officials connected with the Government. The same is true in State governments and in municipalities. Municipal bodies, as well as State legislatures, are frequently called upon to make searching investigations in regard to the conduct of municipal and State organizations and administrative bodies. Even where executive officials are close to the people and their activities bring them into daily contact with the people, nevertheless there are many transgressions by them, and the people are often called upon to rebuke them for their oppressive and illegal conduct.

In business institutions, no matter how diligent those in charge may be and how perfect their administrative organizations may be, there are many injustices practiced by employees and irregularities and crimes by searching investigations are often brought to light. The executive department is not a water-tight compartment in the ship of state which may not be examined by the legislative branch of the Government. Congress taxes the people and makes appropriations to maintain the Government. It is the duty of Congress to see how the money is spent, whether the agencies which it sets up—execu-

tive and administrative—are efficient, competent, and honest, and to that end the responsibility rests upon Congress to frequently investigate all executive and administrative organizations in the Government.

It is believed by many that during the war the Department of Justice and the Department of Labor dealt harshly and sometimes illegally with aliens, and subjected them to treatment not warranted and not to be defended. Recently Congress investigated the Department of Justice, and the condition found therein by many patriotic people was regarded as unclean and rotten. The result of the investigation brought about the separation of the Attorney General, Mr. Daugherty, from his high position. There was an investigation which incidentally involved the Secretary of the Navy, and he departed from his high position. The investigation of the Secretary of the Navy and the oil reserves revealed conditions that were shocking to the American people and led to the prompt separation of the Secretary of the Navy from his important and exalted position.

An investigation was made of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which revealed a situation calling for immediate reform. A searching investigation of the Veterans' Bureau was conducted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] and former Senator Walsh, of Massachusetts. They exposed evils, transgressions, and wrongs and abuses in that bureau which shocked the people and brought about some needed reforms. The Shipping Board has been investigated from time to time, and the unsatisfactory condition of that organization, together with its waste, extravagance, and incompetency, has aroused the American people to demand a radical change in the administration of that agency of the Government.

I could enumerate many investigations conducted by committees of Congress, both special committees and standing committees, which have proved of incalculable benefit to the country.

Senators know that most of the important bills introduced require investigation before suitable measures can be prepared. Before the Committees on Immigration of the House and Senate could frame the existing immigration law, protracted hearings were imperatively required. Hearings are now being conducted which show a situation in the Virgin Islands demanding relief. An investigation of the American occupancy of Haiti was conducted a few years ago which revealed that the United States, without justification, had taken possession of the government of a friendly nation, and military forces of the United States, even at the time of the investigation, were in absolute control of the government, and were subjecting the people to a rigid and oppressive military rule. And I might add in parenthesis that the condition, with some modifications, exists to this very hour.

Mr. President, there should be a searching investigation made of the Immigration Service. It has many hundreds of agents and employees scattered throughout the country, many of whom are efficient and honorable, but some of whom are tyrannous, bureaucratic, incompetent, and utterly unworthy of the positions which they occupy.

Many persons who are here lawfully, or who have wittingly or unwittingly infringed some unimportant regulation or rule of the Immigration Bureau, are being pursued and watched, and oftentimes arrested and subjected to an offensive and oppressive treatment. And I might add that in many cases I believe their arrests have been illegal and their attempted deportation wholly without justification.

But I return to the matter to which I referred in the opening sentence of my remarks. The resolution which I offered is pending before the Immigration Committee. Hearings were had upon two different occasions but not concluded. The evidence thus far adduced in my opinion conclusively proves that Mr. William Hanson, the immigration agent, committed a great wrong and that the immigration officials in Washington acted arbitrarily and unjustly, if not illegally, in dealing with the case of General Torres, and that their course resulted in the surrender of General Torres to Mexican military authorities, who promptly executed him.

The evidence showed that General Torres was a political refugee, that his arrest was not warranted, and that his deportation was in contravention of every rule of humanity, if not a violation of law. Mr. Hanson, the immigration agent in charge, acted in a devious, illegal, and cowardly manner, and upon his head must lay heavily the death of General Torres. He knew that General Torres had been promised 60 days by the department within which he might arrange to depart from the United States. He knew from the information in his possession, and the officials in Washington knew, from the statements made to them by a reputable attorney who represented General Torres, that if he were deported he would be promptly

executed without trial by the military authorities of the Mexican Government.

Captain Hanson testified before the committee, and his own words, in my opinion, convict him of oppressive and illegal acts and ought to have brought about his immediate dishonorable discharge from the service. I note by yesterday's paper that he has resigned, doubtless because of this investigation and because he knew that if a full investigation were made his conduct in other respects would call for admonition.

Mr. President, information has been brought to my attention which shows that the conditions along the border from the Pacific coast to the Gulf of Mexico demands investigation. Some of the agents and representatives of the Department of Justice, according to the information which I have received, have abused their trust and have played into the hands of the Mexican Government. And some of the immigration officials have apparently been more concerned in aiding the Mexican Government than they have been in properly protecting the rights of aliens who were in the United States.

Mr. President, I call attention to the case of Alberlardo Henojosa, which I think I referred to at the time I offered the resolution now before the committee. He was illegally taken from the United States and promptly executed by the military authorities of Mexico. I have a letter from Capt. Frank Hammer, of Texas, head of the Texas Rangers, and a man of ability and integrity, in which he refers to this case. He states that—

this man was a political refugee from Mexico and was arrested at Rio Grande City, Tex., some time after the middle of July, 1925, by Lucio Guerra, deputy sheriff of Starr County, Tex., at the request of Captain Hanson. A few days later General Garcia, military commander of the district of Nuevo Laredo, Mexico, asked for permission to come to the American side of the river for the purpose of going to Brownsville, there to cross back into Mexico and inspect the military posts between Matamoras and Nuevo Laredo on the Mexican side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 3 o'clock having arrived, the Senate will consider the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to refer to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the so-called Muscle Shoals bill, House bill 4106.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall conclude in a few minutes, and hope the Senator from Nebraska will pardon me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah for that purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KING. The letter continues:

General Garcia stated that the reason why he wanted to travel on the American side was that the roads in Mexico were bad. Permission was granted him by the collector of the customs, Mr. Roy Campbell. Upon reaching the town of Romo General Garcia was met by Immigration Inspectors Jesse Perez and B. C. Durham, who had in custody Henojosa. Henojosa was turned over to General Garcia and six Mexican soldiers who accompanied him on the trip, and who were armed, and was taken across the river at this point. At the time Henojosa was surrendered to General Garcia and his men, which occurred on American soil, Henojosa got down on his knees and begged to be shot rather than to be taken across the river and be shot, which request was denied him.

This affair shows that there was a conspiracy previously entered into between Captain Hanson—

Who was the head of the American immigration service upon the border—

and General Garcia, all of which was denied in Washington by Hanson. The two immigration inspectors mentioned were working under Hanson's orders, and will so testify. Other witnesses in the case are the American consul, Walsh, Roy Campbell, collector of customs at Laredo, and Mr. Kahn, deputy collector of customs.

This deportation occurred at Romo, Tex., 14 miles west of Rio Grande City, on the 25th day of July, 1925, at 5 p. m. Mexicans and Americans alike are very indignant and are hoping that a thorough investigation will be had.

There are other statements in this letter which I shall not read, but will hand the letter to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and ask that it be considered in connection with the investigation not yet concluded.

Mr. President, I protest against this cowardly, inhuman, and illegal conduct upon the part of officials of our Government. No department of the Government has attempted to defend the officials of the Immigration Service who surrendered General Torres illegally and in violation of a written promise to men who were eagerly waiting to take his life. I protest against the course of the officials who conspired with General Garcia, the head of the military district of Nuevo Laredo,

Mexico, and who permitted him with his armed soldiers to come into the United States and take an unoffending political refugee from American soil back into Mexico for execution and without trial.

Inspectors Jesse Perez and B. C. Durham should be immediately removed. Indeed, I am not sure that they ought not to be prosecuted. They knew, or must have known, that when they delivered Alberlardo Henojosa to General Garcia and his armed band who had entered the United States for the purpose of going to Brownsville and back into Mexico to inspect military forts that this unfortunate man would be killed.

They knew it to a certainty when Henojosa begged that he be shot upon American soil rather than be dragged back to Mexico, there to be foully murdered. And yet these American officials connived at the deceptive and cowardly course of Mexican military officials. Can it be said that they did not connive at the death of this man?

Mr. President, this matter is of more importance than some think. I promise the Senate that it will not end until justice has been done and all the facts have been revealed. I am unwilling that the United States should rest under the imputation of having violated the law of nations as well as the laws of humanity, as the facts in the cases to which I have referred indicate was done. Our Government should promptly punish all parties who were connected in any manner with the murder of Torres and Henojosa and show by its course its abhorrence and detestation of their acts and conduct.

I protest against the conduct of these agents and officials in seizing political refugees who sought an asylum upon American soil and delivered them into the hands of military forces of a foreign country who were thirsting for their blood and who immediately after receiving them shot them down like dogs.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to make a brief reply to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I agree fully with the Senator from Utah in his denunciation of the slaughter of this Mexican as a wicked murder, but I think that it ought to be said in defense of our own Department of State and Department of Labor that very definite instructions have been issued to all of our immigration officials on the Mexican border that no political refugee, however illegal may be his entry, is to be deported to Mexico if he claims asylum here. He can only be deported to some other country than Mexico. The departments have definite orders out that such refugees shall not be sent back to be murdered in Mexico.

In this particular case—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator refer to the Torres case or the Henojosa case?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am referring to the Torres case, which is the only one with which I am familiar. In the Torres case I do not pretend to say whether Captain Hanson had any private arrangements with Mexicans or not, because I do not know about it. In fairness to him I must say that it did not seem to me to be proved at the hearings.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him again?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KING. The letters which I have, and witnesses are named who will testify to it, show that compensation was paid Mr. Hanson and that the statement was published in a newspaper that his land in a certain province has been returned to him.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. We had a newspaper clipping showing that it had been and we had him saying it had not been, and I did not feel that I could vote to convict him on that showing. But there is this fact that ought to be borne in mind. There was given to the American immigration authorities a copy of a telegram purporting to be signed by the President of Mexico himself, asserting that this man was not a political refugee, but was a murderer and a bandit. There was evidence, I do not know whether worthy or not, but evidence furnished the American authorities, that the man had been guilty of no less than two train wrecks, in which Americans as well as Mexicans were killed. The assurance given by the American officials that this man would not be regarded as a political offender was false from all that we can learn. He was not given a fair trial. He was given a drumhead court-martial at best and he was shot down wantonly, without any opportunity to present his side of the case.

For what the Mexicans did I have not a word of defense, but I do want it to appear in the Record that both our State Department and our Labor Department have tried to avoid such incidents and have sent very definite orders against the deportation to Mexico of political offenders.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I acquit the State Department of any complicity in the outrages mentioned. Secretary Kellogg, as soon as his attention had been called by Ambassador Sheffield to the murder of Torres, addressed a letter to the Immigration Service, which, as I construe it, was a rebuke, or at least was an admonition against a repetition of such conduct.

The information which I have reveals that General Torres was a farmer that, during the military operations in Mexico when Obregon was seeking power, was an officer in Obregon's military forces. After Obregon was elected President, he resigned from the army and returned to private life. Later, when there was civil war, he joined the forces of de la Huerta and held a high military position. He had many soldiers under his command, and, of course, was operating under a superior military commander.

Torres with a portion of his forces was ordered to intercept trains which were conveying munitions of war, principally rifles, cartridges, and pistols. With the trains there were also troops. He carried out his orders, and captured the trains and the munitions which were being transported. Undoubtedly some of the soldiers accompanying the train were killed. Calles, of course, can not forgive Torres. My recollection is that Calles barely escaped from the forces commanded by Torres, and the trains which were captured were carrying munitions to supply the military forces supporting Calles.

Unfortunately, in Mexico the rules of civilized warfare are not always observed. Often the defeated forces are regarded as bandits and the victorious forces too often seek vengeance upon the officers who fall into their hands, who led the vanquished armies. Of course, we can not defend these practices. If Calles had been defeated and fled to the United States, I would have been as earnest in defending him as a political refugee as I would be in defending any of the followers of de la Huerta. My position is that our Government can not tolerate the actions of its agents and officials who seize persons who come to our shores, whether they come legally or illegally, for the purpose of surrendering them to foreign governments, when it is known they would be promptly executed.

MUSCLE SHOALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] to refer to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the so-called Muscle Shoals bill, Senate bill 4106.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in order that we may understand fully the parliamentary situation let me state briefly that the motion which I have made to refer to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the bill reported by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN] comes about as a result of the passage of what was known as House Concurrent Resolution No. 4 several weeks ago by virtue of which a special committee was appointed to receive bids for Muscle Shoals. In accordance with that resolution the committee received bids and had some hearings, and, as authorized and directed, made a report to the Senate, or at least a part of the report was made. I understand the minority part of the report was never presented by the committee and has never been printed.

The chairman of that joint committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DENEEN], reported a bill which in effect leases Muscle Shoals and the property owned by the Government in that vicinity to a corporation or to two corporations named in the bill. My motion is to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The bill itself to which this motion applies, in referring to the method of its introduction, reads as follows:

April 19 (calendar day, April 26), 1926—Mr. DENEEN, from the Joint Committee on Muscle Shoals, reported the following bill; which was read the first time.

April 19 (calendar day, April 28), 1926—Ordered to be printed.

The only effect of the pending motion, should it be agreed to, would be to refer that bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill has not been reported by any committee of the Senate; it has not been referred to a committee; and there has been no opportunity for general hearings which usually take place when bills of this importance are before the various committees for consideration.

I myself was very much surprised that anyone should for a moment contend that the bill should not be referred to a committee; and I was surprised recently to learn of the change of

attitude of a number of Senators, who explained to me their position at the time the original concurrent resolution was pending for the appointment of this committee, who now feel that the bill ought not to be referred to a committee, although at that time they expressed themselves very freely that under the rules and precedents of the Senate whatever bill should be introduced, if there were one, would, of course, be referred to the committee.

I think there is no contention but that the proper committee to which this bill should be referred is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for that committee has handled all of the bills and resolutions pertaining to the Muscle Shoals question. So I am not going to discuss the question as to whether the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would be the proper committee to which the bill should be referred, unless some Senator shall raise the question, but I do not believe that the question will be raised.

Mr. President, I know of no instance where such a course as is now proposed has been taken. To be fair, I wish at the beginning to read the original concurrent resolution as it was adopted, or that part of it which has a bearing, if any part has a bearing, on the question. House Concurrent Resolution No. 4, which authorized the appointment of this committee, contains the following language:

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct negotiations for a lease or leases (but no lease or leases shall be recommended which do not guarantee and safeguard the production of nitrates and other fertilizer ingredients mixed or unmixed primarily as hereinafter provided) of the nitrate and power properties of the United States at Muscle Shoals, Ala., including the quarry properties at Waco, Ala., for the production of nitrates primarily and incidentally for power purposes, such power to be equitably distributed between the communities and States to which it may be properly transported, in order to serve national defense, agriculture, and industrial purposes, and upon terms which so far as possible shall provide benefits to the Government and to agriculture equal to or greater than those set forth in H. R. 518, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, except that the lease or leases shall be for a period not to exceed 50 years.

Said committee shall have leave to report its findings and recommendations, together with a bill or joint resolution for the purpose of carrying them into effect—

Now, note this: It was sought by those who framed the original resolution—and it was framed in the House of Representatives and not in the Senate—to give any bill that might be presented a special privilege when it came into the House. They recognized the fact that they had so to provide in the resolution as originally framed or that the bill would not possess that privilege; so the original resolution provided—

which bill or joint resolution shall, in the House, have the status that is provided for measures enumerated in clause 56 of Rule XI: *Provided*, That the committee shall report to Congress not later than April 26, 1926: *And provided further*, That the committee in making its report shall file for the information of the Senate and House of Representatives a true copy of all proposals submitted to it in the conduct of such negotiations.

Under that authority the joint committee submits its report to the Senate and to the House. The resolution provides what shall be done with the report and the bill in the House. It gives them a parliamentary standing under a rule—and I once before read the rule to the Senate—which in effect provides that when the measure gets into the House the bill shall go to the Committee of the Whole House.

No such attempt was made to control the reference of the bill in the Senate. It comes here under the general rule of the Senate. I believe, as I think 99 per cent of the membership thought, that, without any question, when the bill was introduced it would automatically be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I am not trying now to take any advantage of a technicality. The Chair thought otherwise; the Vice President ruled that under the rules of the Senate the bill went to the calendar; that this bill, coming from the joint committee, would not follow the ordinary course and go to the committee, but would go directly to the calendar. An appeal might have been taken from that ruling, but it seemed to me that it could be reached perhaps better by making a motion to refer the bill to the committee, which motion would be in order, regardless of the rule of the Senate. Any bill, I take it, is always subject to the action of the Senate on a motion to refer it to a committee to which the mover of the motion may desire to have it referred.

That is the condition we are in at the present time. We have this bill, which so far as anything on its face is concerned is practically the same as any other bill introduced by any Member of this body. Its caption reads:

Mr. DENEEN, from the Joint Committee on Muscle Shoals, reported the following bill, which was read the first time.

And so forth.

Mr. President, this very day we have had a similar thing occur in the Senate. A report on the French debt settlement, which was negotiated pursuant to a law passed by Congress providing for a commission to settle it, was sent here and was referred to the Committee on Finance, and properly so. Bills providing for the Italian debt settlement, the English debt settlement, and for seven or eight other debt settlements with foreign governments, were all referred in the same way to a standing committee of the Senate with this exception.

The bills which have been passed in reference to foreign debt settlements were all House bills; but in some cases a similar and identical Senate bill had been introduced, referred to the Committee on Finance, reported from that committee, and placed on the calendar, and when the House bill came over here we considered the House bill, under that parliamentary situation, without having it referred to the committee, because a similar measure had been acted upon by a committee of the Senate. So, for practical purposes, it can be said that in every one of these instances, which are practically similar to the case in hand, although the debt commission law did not say anything about reporting a bill but did provide for a report—and this bill is only a part of the report—in every instance we have taken a course just the contrary to the course that it is now proposed to take as to this particular measure.

Two or three years ago when the agricultural situation began to be acute, it will be remembered there was a concurrent or, perhaps, a joint resolution, at least, however, a concurrent resolution introduced in the House and the Senate authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to make an investigation as to the condition of agriculture and report back to the Senate and to the House recommendations for the relief of the agricultural situation. When that bill came in here it was regularly referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it was reported back from that committee. I have a memorandum of the different steps which were taken in connection with that bill here on my desk and can give the dates, if necessary, when the different steps were taken. It passed the House; it passed the Senate, and, in accordance with its terms, a joint committee was appointed, five from the Senate and five from the House. They held extended hearings, went into the agricultural situation in considerable detail, and submitted a report. A member of that joint committee—I think it was the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]—introduced a bill when the report came back here for the purpose of carrying out the recommendations of the joint committee. No one questioned what should be done with that bill. When it was introduced it was regularly referred to the proper standing committee of the Senate.

It will be remembered that during a Congress which sat several years ago a joint committee on reforestation was appointed. I am not sure whether it was a joint committee or whether it was merely a Senate committee; but, at any rate, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who will take this up more in detail, was chairman of the committee. They went over the country and made quite extensive investigations in various localities, and they reported a bill. They had the bill referred to that joint committee. It came up in the Senate, and it is interesting—and I think the Senator from Oregon will read some of the discussion that took place—to note that unanimously it was agreed that the proper thing to do with that bill was to refer it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which had jurisdiction of the subject; and it was so done by unanimous agreement when the question came before the Senate.

Now it is proposed to take a different course; now it is proposed that in this particular instance the bill introduced by this joint committee or its chairman shall not be referred to the committee. Incidentally, not all the committee joined in reporting the bill. It is an impossibility for a Member of the House to introduce a bill in the Senate, although certain Members of the House are members of the joint committee, just as is the Senator from Illinois. The Senator from Illinois, although given the honor of being elected chairman of the joint committee, has no more authority, no more power on the joint committee than has any Member of the House who is also a member of the joint committee. A Member of the House on that joint committee could not introduce a bill here. Suppose the members of the joint committee did not agree and some of them wanted a different bill, as is the fact in this case. A Member of the House, who is also a member of the joint committee, is opposed to the report and opposed to this bill. He can not introduce his bill here; he is not a Member of this body. That will have to be done by somebody else.

He could come before a standing committee, as is often done; he could come before the Agricultural Committee, if this bill were referred to that committee, and say, "I have a different bill; I want to present it to this committee as a substitute." He is denied that right. He ought to have the same privilege as has the Senator from Illinois, who happens to be a Member of this body instead of the other one. This privilege is denied him; he is denied any hearing.

Mr. President, this bill proposes—and it seems to me to be an outrageous proposition—to lease for 50 years the property of the Government on which the taxpayers' money to the extent of \$150,000,000, in round numbers, has been expended, without ever having a single opportunity for anybody to come before a committee of this body and protest.

Nowhere has any citizen of the country or any official of the Government been given any opportunity to appear and protest against this proposed legislation or to ask for any modification. I do not believe that ever before in the history of our Government has such a course been pursued.

It is said that there have been hearings. I understand that there have been; but, Mr. President, they have been held in secret, behind closed doors. I am not speaking of this in complaint. I am not finding fault with the joint committee for acting in this way. I am simply stating the facts. They were negotiating. They were trying to get bids. They were trying to get the best bids they could. I do not want anybody to get the idea that I am now offering any criticism of anything they have done. I am assuming that they did the best they could; and they could negotiate better in secret, perhaps. At least, that is the way they thought; that is the way they did. They carried on these negotiations earnestly and zealously and ably for several days behind closed doors. They come out now and say: "Here is a bill," and they introduce it, and the Senate has said, through the ruling of its Vice President, "This bill goes to the calendar, and it will be taken up to-morrow and passed," without a hearing ever being granted to anybody.

I am not now offering any criticism of the bill. It may be found to be a good bill, holy and righteous, without a flaw; but we are legislating now, if we take this course, without reference to a standing committee of one of the most important matters that have come before Congress in many and many a day.

Not only that, Mr. President, but even what hearings took place behind closed doors are still secret. Not a syllable has been published; not a word has been given to the public; not a sentence has been disclosed outside of the secret chambers of the committee room. I know that some Senators say: "We have had this subject up many times; we are getting tired of it," and there is a lot in that. I know that we have had it up many times. We have been up and down for two or three years on the question, and especially the committee that has had it in charge, and has viewed it from all angles; but here comes a new one. Here comes one that has never seen the light of day, and you are going to say: "We will brush aside every consideration that has ever been given to this subject by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in all its hearings," which have been public, and, I think everybody will concede, fair. No man has been denied, no corporation has been denied, no partnership has been denied the right to be heard, and heard without limitation, before the committee.

Scientific men have discussed the question of fertilizer through many, many pages of those hearings. Much information has been given to the public, and particularly to the members of the committee and Members of the Senate who have studied the hearings; and yet, when you had all that before you, you appointed another committee to make some further investigation. That shows that you wanted light. That shows that you were not satisfied. That shows that there was something else about it that you wanted to know about; and I am not complaining of it. It was an educational proposition. That has been done—done in secret—and now you propose to take the result of secret deliberations, in the face of all the contrary action that we have been taking in the past, and put this bill on its passage without any Senator having a right to look into those hearings to see what is the reason for this provision or that provision; and Senators are denied so far even the right to see or have printed the minority views.

I was told by the member of that committee who presented the minority views that he wanted them printed with the majority report; that they were in the hands of a member of the joint committee on the very day the majority report was made, although they did not get to the Senate until after the report had actually been made, a few minutes or an hour or such a matter afterward, and they were never presented to the Senate for printing. They could have been presented that day and printed in accordance with the usual custom where there are minority views—printed together—or the time could

have been extended, as we ordinarily extend it for some one to present his views. But the man who had the minority views was a Member of the House, denied the right to stand up here and ask for permission to have his views printed, and yet he was a member of the joint committee, clothed with the same authority and the same responsibility as the Senate members of the joint committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator why the minority report was not printed by some action of the Senate, in view of the fact that this was a joint committee, the result of whose work was alike pertinent both to the Senate and to the House?

Mr. NORRIS. I am going to see if I can not get it printed myself.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was a member of the joint committee and I reserved the right to file a minority report or to offer the bid that I supported as a substitute. I chose to offer it as a substitute, and it has been printed, and is now in the Senate for that purpose. Mr. JAMES, a Congressman from Michigan, a Member of the House, filed a minority report. He did not support either one of the bids at the final meeting of the committee, although he had been favorable to the one that I supported up to that time. He filed his minority report in the House. If I had filed my report it would have been printed with the majority report. That is the way the committee felt about it. This report which has been filed can be obtained, and every Senator can have a copy of the report as Mr. JAMES filed it and as it has been printed in the House. There is no question about that.

Read the majority report and read the minority report and the hearings that we took. A stenographic report of the hearings is here, and if anyone wants to have them printed they can be printed, and every Senator can read them; but so far as sending this bill back to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is concerned, the Senate ought not to do it. There is not anything in any of these reports requiring any such thing. The only things involved are the 50-year lease, the making of fertilizer in time of peace and nitrates in time of war, the amount of money to be paid per horsepower, the building of Dam No. 3 and Cove Creek Dam in the bid I supported, and the leaving out of these dams in the other bid.

What is there complicated about that that requires hearings in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry over which the Senator from Nebraska presides and over which he delights to sit when he has hearings on Muscle Shoals especially? I want the Senate, for the sake of the Senator from Nebraska himself, to deliver him and deliver us from him with Muscle Shoals.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator, himself a member of that committee, can be delivered at any time. He does not need to stay there. He does not need to listen. He is so well posted on all this stuff that he has heard in secret, that has been denied to everybody else, that he does not need to attend the Agricultural Committee.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have to be there to watch the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. If I had nobody else to watch me except the Senator from Alabama, I want to tell you that I could commit all kinds of depredations and never get caught. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. I confess that the Senator is better trained in that than I am. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, no one has ever complained, as far as I know, in connection with this Muscle Shoals matter, about any mistreatment in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If there is anyone who thinks he has been mistreated or knows of anyone who thinks he has been mistreated, if it is known by any Senator, I should like to have him get up right now and interrupt me and tell me who it was and when it was and all about it.

I believe that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry patiently for several years off and on at different times have listened with deep interest to all the questions involved in Muscle Shoals; and they are not simple. The question as to what shall be done with this power is an interesting and a fundamental question. After all, Mr. President, it reaches into every home and every fireside of the South. It comes into the home life of every kitchen in Alabama and the adjoining States. It has an effect upon every manufacturing establishment of that vicinity, and, in so far as it is a precedent, of the entire country, and even of the world. I believe that the possibilities of the Tennessee River in the development of cheap electricity, if properly handled, are surpassed nowhere else on earth. There is for the people in that vicinity, in that country all through the South, an opportunity, through the use

of this great development that the taxpayers of the country have paid for, to give an exhibition of comfort and happiness in the home that has never before been presented to the American people.

This is not a little, idle thing, as the Senator from Alabama has just said, in which nothing is involved except making fertilizer and power. There is very much involved in both of those propositions; and the question of fertilizer is a scientific one, one about which nearly all the great chemists of the United States have testified before the Agricultural Committee, one on which I presume somebody has testified in the secret hearings of this joint committee; but they have brought out a fertilizer proposition that the member of the committee making a minority report says is a fake. We may all agree, when we go into it, that it is a good thing; but the place to go into it is to let men who are qualified to testify on the chemical properties involved in the fertilizer proposition testify in the open, before the world, before a committee of the Senate, and have the testimony printed and laid upon the desks of Senators.

That has not been done. It is not proposed to do it. Personally, I do not believe—and I draw my conclusions from the testimony of experts—that it is a physical possibility under the present knowledge with regard to fertilizer to take the great power of Muscle Shoals and economically convert it into fertilizer—not at a price that will even compete with the present price of fertilizer. This joint committee, however, would have us believe otherwise. Perhaps within these few days they have discovered something new. If they have, let us see it in the light of day. If they have, let us let the sunlight of publicity fall upon it. Take it before the committee. In all the trials and tribulations that the Agricultural Committee have had they have never yet closed the doors when they were taking testimony. They have never yet asked the Senate to pass upon their recommendations based upon testimony taken in secret. They have said: "Here is the testimony. We have preserved it. We have printed it. Look at it and draw your own conclusions, as we had to do." That is what I ask now and nothing else.

An intimation was made by the Senator from Alabama that because I happened to be the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture at present I wanted to sit and hear these things. I want to say to Senators that nothing induces me to make this motion except an honest belief that it is my official duty to make it.

I have listened for months to testimony, some of it unimportant, some of it irrelevant, but volumes of it of deep interest. I went into the question without a preconceived idea as to what should be done with Muscle Shoals. I went into the question without knowing what it cost to make fertilizer. I went into the question without knowing what I believe I have learned, that as the production of fertilizer has advanced and becomes better understood, cheapened by new invention, the tendency has been for years to use less and less power in getting together the ingredients necessary to make fertilizer, particularly in the extraction of nitrogen from the atmosphere, until now, although I am not an expert, yet I have no hesitation in saying that the evidence demonstrates that as we improve and cheapen the method of making fertilizer we are eliminating the consideration of the power question.

I have always criticized the attempt to utilize the power down there as unnecessary. It ought to be used for turning the countless wheels of industry; it ought to be used to act as a servant in the house and help the housewives of the country instead of being useless and not bringing any comfort or happiness to human beings.

I realize that great miracles sometimes happen. May be one has happened, and this joint committee may have discovered a new scientific method, something entirely new, and they may have it covered in this bill. I hope they have. I want to say that there is no man on earth who would be more delighted than I to see the production of fertilizer cheapened, because I realize its importance, its growing importance. That is one of the things I learned in the discussion before the Committee on Agriculture. But let that be true or not, why should not this bill go to a committee the same as other bills, so that we could have a hearing? We should have certain parts of this bill analyzed by experts in the open. All kinds of charges have come to me as to what happened behind those closed doors, which I shall not try to repeat. I think many of them, perhaps all of them, were exaggerated. You never can do a thing in secret and not have exaggerated reports going out, the committee not agreeing when they get through, and one member of the committee saying that, as far as fertilizer is concerned, the bill is a fake—and he is an honored Member of the House; he is not a new Member in the Muscle Shoals proposition. He

was considering Muscle Shoals before some of the Senate Members on the joint committee were even Members of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to call the Senator's attention to section 5 of the proposed power company bill on this very subject. It is short and reads as follows:

The fertilizer company will offer for sale the fertilizer so produced to farmers, cooperative purchasing organizations of farmers, or associations of farmers, and to others. The fertilizer company agrees that it will manufacture and sell fertilizer at cost plus 8 per cent profit; cost to include all costs entering into the operation and maintenance of the leased premises and fertilizer plants, the manufacture, storage, sale, and distribution of fertilizer and including power at cost to the power company, 6 per cent on capital invested by the fertilizer company, less depreciation, and $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent depreciation annually on the plants erected by the fertilizer company. Cost will be ascertained annually by competent auditors and selling prices approved for the following year based on the cost of the previous year.

The question I desire to ask the Senator is this: From his study of the cost of producing synthetic nitrogen, as it is covered by this bill, can it be done in competition with the Chilean nitrate organization, when we include this $21\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the cost price?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, it is only an opinion I express, but I have no hesitancy in saying that it can not be done. I may be wrong. During the few months I have been studying this some man may have discovered something new and can do it. I will hail him with joy if he has. I am only giving my opinion from several years' study of the question.

I had not intended, I do not intend, to discuss this bill in any detail now.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, before the Senator goes from that—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. I understood the Senator to declare himself at the outset in favor of a synthetic process and to state that it was much cheaper than the other, which it is; and that very little power would be required to make fertilizer by that process. If the synthetic process is cheaper than the cyanamid process, as some claim it is, does not the Senator think that the fertilizer thus produced would be cheaper?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have a hope in human progress. I have a belief that we are going to cheapen the production of fertilizer. I think that day is coming. The most promising field is through the synthetic process. It is not through the cyanamid process, the one we have in nitrate plant No. 2.

That is out of date now. But we have not reached that time yet. The manufacturer of fertilizer has been cheapened within the last few years. It has gone down somewhat since we have been investigating Muscle Shoals. But it has not reached the point to which it must go so that it will be cheaper than it is now in the market. I think that time is coming. Maybe the wish is father of the thought.

I did not expect to discuss the production of fertilizer to-day, but there are very few people, in my judgment, in our country, particularly in my section of the country—and I come from a section of the country that does not use much fertilizer—who realize the value of it, who realize that the world itself is confronted with a very important proposition in the manufacture of fertilizer. We must have more fertilizer, and to get more fertilizer we must have cheaper fertilizer. My way of getting at increased production would be to have experimentation. We can not expect private individuals to experiment in order to cheapen the production, so much as we expect the Government to enter that field. It is, in my opinion, a very proper governmental activity, and in the bill I introduced and tried to have passed, I provided for the widest experimentation in the fertilizer field down at Muscle Shoals that has ever been undertaken in the civilized world.

I would spend Government money on it. I am willing to take money out of the Treasury to pay for such experimentation. We have some of the best men in the world engaged in that work. A man now working for the Government at a modest salary is referred to by all the scientific men, the chemists, practically of the world, for some of the inventions he has made that have cheapened the production of fertilizer. I have gone through their laboratories, where there were dozens of expert chemists working, making various kinds of experiments. They do not know that they will succeed. They may lose the money they put into it.

If we are to be honest about it, let us face the situation as it is. But it is worthy of investigation. That is a proper way

LXVII—536

to spend the people's money in an effort to see if we can not improve and cheapen fertilizer. Something may happen not now known to us and to the scientific world that may bring it about in another way, but as far as the scientific men can see to-day, what we have to do is to experiment, and continue to experiment, until we are able to cheapen it. We know, for instance, that nitrogen is all around and about us in abundance, and the soil beneath our feet is suffering for it. The thing to do is to take it from one place and put it in the soil, where the roots of the plants can get the benefit of it.

Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture has not promised any revolution. We do not promise anything except that we will try to do the best we can. We do not promise that we can cut the price of fertilizer in two, as has been so often asserted in favor of bids in the past, always, I think, without foundation. But if we want to reach the right conclusion, let us go about it in a way that will give some promise of bringing results.

I do not want to give away this vast and valuable property of our Government to somebody to make a lot of nitrates, when the cost of making them would be so high they could not be used after they were made. There are men who want to keep this power out of use, who would be glad to use it to operate plant No. 2, which will produce 40,000 tons of nitrogen a year. It would take most of the water power there to do that. But what would be done with the nitrogen produced there? It would cost so much it could not be used for fertilizer. It could never be done, except in time of war, when we needed explosives, when the cost was a secondary consideration.

We might just as well tell the farmers to begin with that there is nothing in it for them; that it will not cheapen fertilizer. I take it the Senate does not want to subsidize anybody. You could say, "We will give you this water power. Take it for nothing, but make as much fertilizer as you can and sell it below the present cost," and they could do it. They would lose on fertilizer, but make it up on water power. That could be done. But does anybody want to legislate in that way? If we are going to subsidize the production of fertilizer, we must do it on a gigantic scale, and subsidize it so that all the farmers of the country will be able to get the benefit of it. It would take a thousand Muscle Shoals to do that. So I take it that Senators do not want to subsidize anybody. There are those who would be glad to do it, and it would have this effect, that it would keep the water power out of use and enable existing power companies to keep the control that they already have.

I would like to dissociate a consideration of the merits of this proposition from the simple fact that under our practice and under a fair method of reaching good legislation this bill ought to be referred to a committee. If there is any Member of the Senate who thinks it ought to go to some other committee than the Committee on Agriculture, I will not offer any objection. I did not when the discussion started. I knew it would be an awful task. I feared it was going to be a thankless one, and I knew I did not know very much about it, except that I knew it was gigantic in proportions. I said on the floor of the Senate that I was perfectly willing that it should go to some other committee. I suggested that the original bill be sent to the Committee on Military Affairs, to which committee it has been sent in the House. I am willing that it should go to that committee now. I am not looking for a job. I have more than I can tend to now, and so has the committee. If this bill goes to the committee we will have to lay aside some other things that we ought to do.

We are very crowded with work, it is true. But for heaven's sake, Senators, in an important matter like this, after we have gone this far, after we have given the time and attention we have, let us not give it away now on a report that is made in secret and without any evidence, without any opportunity for anybody to be heard. It seems to me it would bring on to us a scandal in the years to come. It would be said, "You gave away this valuable property on a secret report, on secret evidence, on hearings held behind closed doors. You never permitted a citizen of the United States to come before a regular committee to protest." Let us see if anybody did protest before the committee. I am going to read a copy of a letter directed to the joint committee by several representatives of farm organizations:

APRIL 24, 1926.

Senator CHAS. S. DENEEEN,

Chairman Joint Committee on Muscle Shoals,

Washington, D. C.:

It is with genuine regret that we confess our inability to contribute to your committee a worth while opinion or comment with reference

to the pending bids for Muscle Shoals—and this because gentlemen who we were advised represent the leading bidders have refused to impart to us any information whatsoever, while even the Department of Agriculture had impressed upon us that such facts as it possesses are inviolate. And while as ordinary farmers we may not have the capacity to understand the why's and wherefore's of all this mystery and secrecy, we are nevertheless duly awed by its existence.

We realized in the beginning that any investigation that we might make at this late day would, of necessity, be most imperfect—and yet we had hoped that, without disclosing the intimate details, the various bidders would be willing to discuss their proposals with us in such general terms as would enable us to at least form a surface opinion of some value. In these premises we respectfully submit to your commission the following observations:

First. That the maintenance and rehabilitation of soil fertility is a matter of the most profound concern to the future of American agriculture.

Second. That Muscle Shoals was built for the express purpose of supplying of ammunition in time of war and cheap fertilizer for the farmers of the United States in time of peace.

Third. We submit that Congress should guard with extreme care the disposition of this, one of the greatest natural resources still in its possession.

Our inability to obtain even the slightest information concerning this great project has only sharpened our interest in it, and we will therefore no doubt address a general comment concerning it to Congress when the report of your honorable committee has been made public.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM HIRTH,
Chairman Corn Belt Committee.
C. O. MOSER,
General Manager American Cotton Growers' Association.
W. H. SETTLE,
President Indiana Farm Bureau.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. These gentlemen were all invited to appear and did appear before the committee. Those who desired to do so testified. The other representatives of farm bureaus and organizations stated that they had received copies of the bids from the power companies, from all the companies who made bids, and these gentlemen could have obtained the bids just as the others did if they had desired them. We had no request from them on the subject, I believe, until the last day that we were in session, when we were considering the two bids which we had determined were the best in the lot.

Mr. NORRIS. If representatives of the farm organizations appeared, it will, of course, show in the hearings, none of which have been printed, all of which are secret now. As to whether these gentlemen have taken the proper course or not I leave with the Senate. I do not know. I am reading what they said. I am reading the communication they sent to the committee. I am not saying that the committee did wrong in the matter. I do not know. None of us know. At least the opportunity ought to be given to men like this to be heard at length and to consider in detail every proposition, and the place to hear them is before the standing committee of the Senate where the bill ought to be referred.

Mr. President, since the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] has entered the Chamber, I will say I have referred to action taken in a committee of which the Senator was chairman. I had not given any of the details, but have stated to the Senate that I thought the Senator from Oregon would give them when he came into the Chamber.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, this matter has been discussed so much that I am not going to take time to go into it in detail. It has been before the Congress for about 10 years. Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, running into the thousands of pages, are there available to any Senator who wants to peruse the volumes.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has just returned from a trip to Muscle Shoals in my State. He has been visiting down there in the garden spot of the world. He had a most delightful time down there. While he was there he outlined his plans as to the things he proposed to do when he returned to Washington. I have on my desk a local newspaper in which they give some statements from the Senator. One was that when he returned to Washington the first fight he would make would be to have the bid, whatever it was, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, if he failed in that, he had been gathering up data sufficient to enable him to filibuster for about three weeks and that he would undertake to prevent action at this session of Congress.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator. Will he yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator state to the Senate that I said that as a matter of fact?

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not say the Senator said it.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to be sure whether the Senator said that I made that statement. I have no objection to his repeating anything that comes from somebody else, but if he is going to make the statement that I said something I want to know whether he is saying that I said it.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not hear the Senator say it. If I had heard it, I certainly would say so.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; of course the Senator would, and if I had said it then I would say it now, too.

Mr. HEFLIN. I will just read it for the edification—

Mr. NORRIS. What is the Senator reading?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am reading from the Florence Times-News.

Mr. NORRIS. And the Senator is going to say, is he, that whatever that article says is what I said, and that I did say it? I want to say to the Senator that any statement that I said if I failed to get this bill referred to the committee I would filibuster and prevent action is absolutely without any foundation whatever. With that statement, he can read anything he pleases.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am glad to hear the Senator say that, but the statement was so in keeping with the Senator's conduct on all occasions heretofore that it impressed me that it was the truth.

Mr. NORRIS. I deny that also. I do not know whether the simple statement of the Senator from Alabama ought to bring a denial, but in this case I will make one.

Mr. HEFLIN. The statement of the Senator from Alabama is the truth regarding the things that he talks about here, and in particular when he speaks of the Senator from Nebraska, and it does not make very much difference what he says. The Senator from Nebraska wants this bill referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think his purpose in it is to kill it and to prevent action at this session of Congress. The Senator is at liberty to pursue the course he sees fit to pursue, but he must not impugn the motives of other Senators and Members of the House because they do not agree with him. The dilly-dallying tactics the Senator has indulged in have favored the power companies from the outset. There are more ways to serve the Power Trust than by standing up and openly championing their cause. It can be done by indirection. It can be done by various movements, parliamentary and otherwise. The result of the action of the Senator from Nebraska has been exactly what the Power Trust want. They have not wanted action in the Senate and in the House upon this bill, and the action of the Senator from Nebraska has resulted in no action being taken. That is exactly what they wanted. The Senator is here now at his same old tricks, pleading to have the measure committed to his committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where it can be entombed and never see the light of day in this session of Congress. I do not think a majority of the Senators will consider for a moment the matter of being led into the trap of the innocent-appearing Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The proposition now before the Senate in regard to the bill is to give Muscle Shoals to the power company. If I have been so wicked in trying to give it to the power company, here is my opportunity to give it to them by just joining with the Senator from Alabama, and they would have it.

Mr. HEFLIN. All right, let us see about that. Let us analyze that proposition for a moment. The Alabama Power Co. in my State have this property leased now, and they are not paying very much for it. It would be to their interest to have no action, because the bid, which I do not now support, which is reported by the majority, which requires more pay at their hands, and they would naturally rather have, as anybody would, the situation that now exists than to have one that would be created under the new bid. If the Senator can succeed in preventing action at this session, they will continue in control for eight months for a pittance, whereas if either one of the bids reported shall be adopted, they will have more to pay and there will be fertilizer arrangements tied in the transaction. That is the difference in the situation.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand the Senator, then, the Alabama Power Co. is anxious to have the bid rejected.

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I do not think so.

Mr. NORRIS. From what the Senator said it would be to their interest to have it rejected.

Mr. HEFLIN. I said that they would, naturally, rather have it not acted on at this session of Congress, as the matter now stands, because if the majority report is adopted then 13 southern companies tied together will have the property and not one. If I were the one who had it and could hold it for eight months more by paying no more than is now being received by the Government, I would not object to having it remain in my individual hands for eight months more. With the Senator from Nebraska pursuing this course, he is playing right into the hands of those who have it now. If this bill, reported by a majority of the committee, can be amended, and it can be, and, supported, it may be, by a large majority of the Senate, a strong fertilizer provision can be inserted in it, and if Dam No. 3 can be provided for, and power distributed at a reasonable rate to the consumer, I would under those conditions support it. Then, if we could all get behind it and make the bid what we want it to be we can dispose of Muscle Shoals, as the President wants done and as Congress wants done and as everybody in the country wants done, except the distinguished and able Senator from Nebraska. God only knows what he would do if he did not have Muscle Shoals to hug to his bosom. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Alabama says that everybody is in favor of it except the Senator from Nebraska. He may be correct about that; but I saw an item in a Tennessee newspaper a day or two ago to the effect that the mayors and the aldermen of the cities of Tusculum, Sheffield, and Florence had wired protests to the Senator from Alabama and his colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] against turning this project over to the power companies. Was that correct or not?

Mr. HEFLIN. Some of those gentlemen did that in the outset, but other gentlemen there who are against the bid as it now stands, say that if the amendment which I have on my desk regarding the production of fertilizer and another relative to Dam No. 3 can be put into this measure they would like for me and my colleague to support it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. That dam is down near the State of the Senator from Tennessee, and Dam No. 3 means much to the navigation of the Tennessee River.

Mr. McKELLAR. But it is not in this bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. And some of the companies in the Senator's State are included in the Southern Power Co.'s bid, which I did not support, but I have no prejudice against any of them. If that bid can be made the best bid—and some Senators here who have read it tell me that they think it is the best bid that has ever been offered; that it is much better than the Ford bid—so I repeat that if we can make it what we want it by amending it, I am going to support it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question about amending it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the question involves a practical proposition. The bill, as I understand, accepts a bid. Now, if we can amend the bill it will have to be with the consent of the other party, will it not?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. So that if there shall be any amendment added to the bill we will have to have the assurance that it will be agreeable to the persons who submitted the bid. We will have to have an understanding of that kind, or we ought to have at least, before we act on any amendment?

Mr. HEFLIN. I said when the concurrent resolution was in this body for consideration that if amendments were offered the bidder could be consulted, and if he consented to them the bill could be amended after it came back here. That is the opinion of all of those with whom I have talked. I myself have no doubt about it. There is no use on earth of sending the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Nebraska is becoming so generous now that he is willing, if Senators do not think the bill should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to send it to any old committee, whether such committee has any jurisdiction over it or not or whether it will consider it or not. He is in favor of anything to get the bill out of the Senate Chamber.

However, the high-sounding phrases which the Senator is quoted as having uttered down at Muscle Shoals about what he was going to do are very amusing, Mr. President. I have a letter from a distinguished gentleman down there. He is mayor of one of the towns of which the Senator from Tennessee

[Mr. McKELLAR] spoke. He tells about some of the conversations that our good friend from Nebraska had when he was visiting Muscle Shoals, riding around with the officials of the Alabama Power Co., basking in the sunshine of their splendid hospitality [laughter], his face wreathed in smiles of calm magnificence, perfectly satisfied and content, riding over the boulevards and out on the splendid highways, having a good time. He hurried back here, getting here the very night we made our report, armed and equipped for battle. He is ready to proceed. The newspaper to which I have referred said the Senator from Nebraska was going to make the motion to refer the bill to the committee of which he was chairman. Well, he has done it. That much of the newspaper report is true. Then, the newspaper stated that the Senator from Nebraska was going to filibuster against the measure. The Senator said that was not true. Now we shall see when we get the measure up for actual consideration whether or not that is true. The Senator from Nebraska may think now that that is not true; he may think now that he will not filibuster; but I know how he loves the name of Muscle Shoals; I know how fascinated and charmed he is by the very suggestion of Muscle Shoals; I know how reluctant he is to give it up; and, Mr. President, when the opportunity comes to him finally to make one more speech and to plead that the bill shall go to his committee, I do not think he will be able to resist the temptation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield there?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. NORRIS. The question which the Senator is discussing is not whether or not I am going to filibuster, but whether I said to the people of Alabama that I was going to filibuster. I hope the Senator from Alabama will give me credit for having sufficient intelligence that even if I were thoroughly permeated with the idea of filibustering I would not go down and tell about it in advance. What I said was that I never told anybody that I was going to filibuster. The fact that I later on may filibuster, let us say, is not proof that I said in advance that I was going to do it. That is the only point I am making.

Mr. HEFLIN. I knew the Senator from Nebraska was going to back off from that.

Mr. NORRIS. No; I am not backing off from it. I may commence to filibuster to-morrow; I do not know.

Mr. HEFLIN. As soon as I mention Muscle Shoals, the Senator from Nebraska rises to interrupt, and says that he might commence to filibuster to-morrow, that he loves Muscle Shoals, and hates to see it go. He does, too, Mr. President; he has shed copious tears over this subject, enough tears to form a river deep enough and broad enough to wet the wheels of every power company in the Nation.

I have here a letter which I received from a distinguished citizen down there regarding the visit of the Senator from Nebraska. The writer says—and I hope the Senator from Nebraska did not say this—

I am informed that he said that he knew that President Coolidge had sent for Ford and that while Ford was a guest at the White House had promised to give him Muscle Shoals if he would not become a candidate for President.

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet." [Laughter.]

Oh, what a difference just a few drinks make—not drinks [laughter]; what I mean is what a difference a little distance makes! [Laughter.]

'Tis distance lends enchantment to the view.

I am talking now about the Senator's interview. President Coolidge trafficking on Muscle Shoals with Henry Ford and promising to give him Muscle Shoals to keep him from running for President! Is not that interesting? The writer of the letter quotes the Senator as talking along that line. I wonder if he did.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator does not believe, does he, that the Senator from Nebraska made any such statement as that?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am sorry the Senator from Montana feels called on to try to make a denial for the Senator from Nebraska when that Senator is sitting right in front of me and is amply able to make his own denial; and, with all due deference to my good friend, I think he is able to do it as well or better than the Senator from Montana can do it for him.

Mr. WHEELER. There is no doubt about that; but I am just asking the Senator, who made the statement as if he believed it—

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I am not expressing any belief.

Mr. WHEELER. I am asking the Senator if he believes it?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am not expressing beliefs; I am reading from a letter, and the Senator from Nebraska is sitting in the Chamber. He knows whether he said it or not. It seems to me that I have heard something like that before somewhere around here. The Senator from Nebraska knows whether he said it or not.

Now, Mr. President, let me give the history of this legislation in a nutshell. The House passed the Ford bill years ago; it died in the Senate. The Underwood bill passed, went to conference, and the conference report was never acted on. The President appointed a commission to go down and see if it could dispose of Muscle Shoals, and that commission failed. He then asked Congress to raise a commission of its own, three Members from each branch of Congress, and for them to go out and advertise and solicit bids and negotiate if they could. For six weeks we sat, morning, afternoon, and night. We wired and wrote to everybody that we thought would be interested. We sent them copies of the resolution, copies of the Ford bill. Gentlemen came down and submitted their bids. We went over them and had taken down the statements which we thought should be taken down. They have been typewritten. They can be printed; nobody objects to that; I have not the slightest objection to it. The bids are here; they are stated in plain English. The report explains them, and Senators are competent to know what the provisions of the bill are when they are read from the Clerk's desk and discussed in this body without ever taking up the time to refer it back to the Committee on Agriculture for hearings.

Why should we have any further hearing? The main questions involved are a 50-year lease, the matter of making nitrates for the Government in time of war—and both bids provide for that—and making fertilizer in time of peace, and both bids provide for that. The bid that I favor proposes to make 20,000 tons of fixed nitrogen and 40,000 tons, provided the Government will build Dam No. 3 and Cove Creek Dam and let them amortize it and pay for it as Ford agreed to pay for Dam No. 3. In that event they will make 40,000 tons. Then the southern companies came in, amended their bid, and agreed to make 40,000 tons outright, without reference to Dam No. 3 or Cove Creek Dam. That is the situation. They agreed to pay \$20 a horsepower. All that is set out in the report. I have given Senators, in substance, what is in these bids. What is there complicated about that that would require the bill to be sent to a committee?

Senators, I wish to say this before I close: We are reaching the end of the session of Congress; the President wants this question disposed of; we would all like to dispose of it. God knows I would like to be done with it. However much it may pain the Senator from Nebraska to give up the pleasure of hearing the charming name of Muscle Shoals, I want to see it taken out of his presence; it will be good for him. He has worried over it a great deal; I think he is worried about us, too. At times I think he has had the hallucination that if anything should happen to him the country would go to the bow wows; he hardly knows what would happen if he should chance to pass out. Muscle Shoals! The newspapers down there reported that the Senator said, "I will try to have the bill referred to my committee; and if I fail, I will indulge in filibustering tactics." The Senator says he did not make either one of those statements, but he has already moved to refer the bill to his committee, and it remains to be seen whether he will filibuster or not.

There are others of us who have studied this question. The project is located in my State; I am on the committee; I do not want the bill referred back to the Committee on Agriculture. There is no valid reason for sending it there. I think I know what would happen if it should go there. I think the Senator would begin to call in people to be heard, and when we asked to close the hearing and hurry the bill back to the Senate he would say, "We ought not to stop the hearing so long as anybody wants to be heard." I know the Senator; I served with him in the House of Representatives; I have served with him here; and I have been on the committee with him. He is a very valuable legislator in many respects, but when it comes to Muscle Shoals he is as blind as a bat. [Laughter.]

If I can I want to take this thing away from him. It will be good for his health. I want to see him smile again as he used to, before he felt that on his back was the burden of the world. [Laughter.] I want to see him smile and step lightly around here, and I am going to do this for his good. I do not want to see him assume the attitude of a man who was in the asylum when a number of ladies and gentlemen went there to visit the place and said, "We would like to go through the institution." A gentleman, with long hair and a rather distinguished look, who was standing there, said, "I will be delighted to show you around." So he took them through the institution, and as they

were proceeding they saw a man at a window standing in a rather dramatic pose, as if he were about to speak to some one outside, and they asked "Who is that?" He replied, "He is a nut who came in here on account of some invention that he was trying to put over; he slipped a cog on that subject." They went on and found another man sitting at a table writing as fast as he could, with his pen flying across the pages, and they asked, "Who is he?" Their escort replied, "He thinks he is Lord Byron; he is working on Childe Harold's Pilgrimage." They went on further, and they saw another man standing up with one hand in the breast of his Prince Albert, gesticulating with the other and working his lips as he looked about, and they asked, "Who is he?" Their escort replied, "He thinks he is Daniel Webster making a speech in the Senate." They went along a little farther and they saw a man dictating to two or three imaginary stenographers, and they said, "Pray, tell us who this man is?" and their escort said, "He is the craziest one of 'em all. He thinks he is Caesar, but he is not; I myself am Caesar." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, there is other legislation pending here which ought to be considered, and I do not want to delay the Senate in its consideration of other measures. This matter ought to be disposed of this afternoon, and I move to lay upon the table the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McMaster	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	McNary	Simmons
Blease	Gillett	Mayfield	Smith
Borah	Goff	Means	Smoot
Bratton	Gooding	Metcalf	Stanfield
Broussard	Hale	Norbeck	Steck
Bruce	Harrell	Norris	Stephens
Cameron	Harrison	Nye	Swanson
Couzens	Heflin	Oddie	Trammell
Cummins	Howell	Overman	Tyson
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Underwood
Dale	Jones, Wash.	Pine	Walsh
Deneen	Kendrick	Ransdell	Warren
Dill	Keyes	Reed, Pa.	Watson
Edge	King	Robinson, Ark.	Weller
Ernst	La Follette	Sackett	Wheeler
Fernald	Lenroot	Sheppard	Williams
Ferris	McKellar	Shipstead	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to lay on the table is not debatable. Does the Senator rise to debate the question?

Mr. McNARY. I ask the attention of the able and amusing Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. I appeal to his sense of justice. After delivering a merrymaking speech here of some length, I do not think it is fair to attempt to cut off debate by making a motion to lay on the table.

I have a very few brief remarks to make, not with respect to the merits of these proposals but with respect to the parliamentary situation and the precedents that have been heretofore established by the Senate, and in all fairness I certainly should have an opportunity to do that.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to say frankly to my friend the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon—for I am his friend—that information has come to me that an effort is going to be made to carry this matter over through tomorrow and not let us get action even on the matter of referring the bill until Monday. We can not afford to permit that. The Senator from Nebraska occupied the floor longer than I did. The Senator from Tennessee interrupted him, and then I made a brief speech and moved to lay his motion on the table.

I think nine-tenths of the Senators here indorse that motion. A dozen Senators have told me since that they were glad I made it—Senators on both sides. I would love to withdraw it at the request of my good friend, but he can make his statement just as well after the motion is voted upon.

Mr. McNARY. That would be true if I were to speak to the merits of this proposal; but the remarks I desire to make go to the question of what has been the practice and procedure of the Senate in cases of pure analogy.

Mr. HEFLIN. That would not do any good, Mr. President. I believe that a majority of this body is determined to do its best to get action at this session of Congress. We want to get action in concert with the other body.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator does not withdraw his motion.

Mr. HEFLIN. For that reason I can not withdraw the motion.
Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.
The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRATTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON]. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay," and the junior Senator from Indiana would vote "yea." Under the circumstances, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BROUSSARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who is unavoidably absent. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I vote "yea."

Mr. FERRIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PEPPER]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. TRAMMELL (when Mr. FLETCHER's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER]. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. NORBECK (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BAYARD]. If he were present, he would vote as I intend to vote, and therefore I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote, and therefore I will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. MAYFIELD. The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. BRATTON. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] on account of illness.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDWARDS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND]. If present, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—39

Bingham	Gillett	Oddie	Stephens
Broussard	Goff	Phipps	Swanson
Bruce	Hale	Pine	Tyson
Curtis	Harris	Ransdell	Underwood
Dale	Harrison	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Deneen	Hefflin	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Sackett	Weller
Ernst	Keyes	Shortridge	Williams
Fernald	Means	Smoot	Willis
Fess	Metcalf	Steck	

NAYS—31

Ashurst	Frazier	Lenroot	Sheppard
Blease	Gooding	McKellar	Shipstead
Borah	Harrell	McMaster	Simmons
Bratton	Howell	McNary	Smith
Cameron	Jones, N. Mex.	Mayfield	Stanfield
Couzens	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Walsh
Cummins	King	Nye	Wheeler
Dill	La Follette	Overman	

NOT VOTING—26

Bayard	Caraway	Edwards	George
Butler	Copeland	Ferris	Gerry
Capper	du Pont	Fletcher	Glass

Greene
Johnson
McKinley
McLean

Moses
Neely
Norbeck
Pepper

Pittman
Reed, Mo.
Robinson, Ind.
Schall

Trammell
Wadsworth

So Mr. NORRIS's motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was laid on the table.

Mr. DENEEN. Mr. President, I desire to file the minority views from the Joint Committee on Muscle Shoals. When the majority report was presented the minority views had not been prepared, and I file them for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The minority views will be received and printed as part 2 of Report No. 672.

Mr. DENEEN. I submit a resolution for printing 5,000 copies of the report on Muscle Shoals accompanying the bill.

The resolution (S. Res. 216) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 672, accompanying the bill (S. 4106) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to execute a lease with the Muscle Shoals Fertilizer Co. and the Muscle Shoals Power Distributing Co., and for other purposes, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does that include the minority views?

Mr. DENEEN. Yes; it will include the minority views.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is understood that both reports will be printed together. I have no objection under that assurance.

Mr. DENEEN. I have no objection to that. The resolution will include the printing of 5,000 copies of the minority views, to be attached to the majority report. The majority report has been printed. To-morrow I shall introduce a resolution for the printing of the testimony.

Mr. MCKELLAR. If both reports are included, I have no objection. I ask that the words "together with the minority views" be inserted in the resolution.

Mr. DENEEN. Very well; I accept the modification.

The resolution as modified was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 672, accompanying the bill (S. 4106) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to execute a lease with the Muscle Shoals Fertilizer Co. and the Muscle Shoals Power Distributing Co., and for other purposes, together with the minority views, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

SETTLEMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC
(S. DOC. NO. 102)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying document, referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am submitting herewith for the consideration of the Congress a copy of an agreement dated April 29, 1926, executed by the Secretary of the Treasury as chairman of the World War Foreign Debt Commission, providing for the settlement of the indebtedness of the French Republic to the United States of America. The agreement was approved by me on April 29, 1926, subject to the approval of Congress, pursuant to authority conferred by act approved February 9, 1922, as amended by act approved February 28, 1923, and as further amended by act approved January 21, 1925.

I believe that the settlement upon the terms set forth in the agreement is fair and just to both Governments, and recommend its approval.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 30, 1926.

PROPOSED PHILIPPINE MISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Washington, April 29, 1926.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have to acknowledge receipt of Senate Resolution No. 196, requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to advise the Senate as to whether or not any funds in the Treasury are available under any existing appropriation act for the payment of the expenses of an investigation of conditions in the Philippine Islands by Carmi Thompson, Esq., of Ohio, recently reported to have been appointed by the President of the United States to make such investigation.

In reply, you are informed that the Treasury knows of no funds under any existing appropriation act available for this purpose. As the Treasury has no information on this subject, and as it is one that

presumably would come under the jurisdiction of the War Department, it is suggested that information relating thereto possibly may be obtained from the Secretary of War.

Respectfully,

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. KING subsequently said: Mr. President, I note that in response to a resolution which I offered a few days ago, asking the Secretary of the Treasury to inform us whether the President had any funds available for the sending of a roving commission to the Philippine Islands, headed by Carmi Thompson, he replies that no funds whatever are available in the Treasury Department for that purpose. The letter which has just been transmitted by the Secretary indicates that possibly the War Department may have some such funds. Accordingly, I shall offer a resolution to see if we can find whether, in some of the departments or in some bureau, there are funds available for this roving commission.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 10198, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
April 29, 1926.

Resolved, That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 46, 56, 100, and 102 to the bill (H. R. 10198) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, and for other purposes, and concurs therein.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 109, and concurs therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

That any person employed under any of the provisions of this act who has been employed for 10 consecutive months or more shall not be denied the leave of absence with pay for which the law provides.

That the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 110, and concurs therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following.

SEC. 7. Hereafter in the payment of compensation of per diem employees of the government of the District of Columbia a signature by mark duly witnessed by an employee of such District designated for that purpose by the commissioners, shall be deemed a full legal acquittance as to such signature.

Mr. PHIPPS. The House conferees, under the rule of the House, asked for action on certain amendments. I will say that they are merely textual in form and clarify the language in a few cases without changing the meaning of the amendments that the Senate placed in the bill. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 109 and 110.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H. R. 2761. An act for the relief of Nora B. Sherrier Johnson;

H. R. 2797. An act for the relief of Mary M. Pride;

H. R. 3797. An act to increase the limit of cost of public building at Decatur, Ala.;

H. R. 3971. An act to correct and perfect title to certain lands and portions of lots in Centerville, Iowa, in the United States of America, and authorizing the conveyance of title in certain other lands and portions of lots adjacent to the United States post-office site in Centerville, Iowa, to the record owners thereof, by the Secretary of the Treasury;

H. R. 7904. An act granting the consent of Congress to Des Arc Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the White River at Des Arc, Ark.;

H. R. 7818. An act to amend section 304 of an act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in livestock, livestock products, dairy products, poultry, poultry products, and eggs, and for other purposes," approved August 15, 1921;

H. R. 8817. An act reserving certain described lands in Coos County, Oreg., as public parks and camp sites;

H. R. 9348. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Weirton Bridge & Development Co. for the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River near Steubenville, Ohio;

H. R. 9494. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River on the Gainesboro-Red Boiling Springs road in Jackson County, Tenn.;

H. R. 9503. An act granting permission to the State Highway Commission of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at Savannah, Hardin County, Tenn., on the Savannah-Selmer road;

H. R. 9505. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Waverly-Camden road between Humphreys and Benton Counties, Tenn.;

H. R. 9506. An act granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River on the Linden-Lexington road in Perry and Decatur Counties, Tenn.;

H. R. 10002. An act granting the consent of Congress to H. J. Stannert, Harry Weis, and George W. Rockwell to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Susquehanna River from a point in the city of Sunbury, Northumberland County, to a point in the township of Monroe, in Snyder County, in the State of Pennsylvania; and

S. 2296. An act authorizing insurance companies or associations, or fraternal or beneficial societies to file bills of interpleader.

COURTS IN MONTANA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5701) to designate the times and places of holding terms of the United States District Court for the District of Montana, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments disagreed to by the House, accede to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. GILLET, Mr. GOFF, and Mr. WALSH conferees on the part of the Senate.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGES

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 9460) granting the consent of Congress to the highway department of the State of Minnesota to reconstruct a bridge across the Mississippi River between the city of Anoka, in Anoka County, and Champlin, in Hennepin County, Minn., and I submit a report (No. 726) thereon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 9596) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River in the county of Aitkin, Minn., and I submit a report (No. 727) thereon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 10121) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River," approved January 31, 1923, and I submit a report (No. 728) thereon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 10470) granting the consent of Congress to the city of Little Falls, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or

near the southeast corner of lot 3, section 34, township 41 north, range 32 west, and I submit a report (No. 730) thereon.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "1906," to strike out the comma and the following words: "and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act. The construction of such bridge shall not be commenced, nor shall any alteration in the plans for the same be made either before or after its completion, until the plans and specifications for the bridge or for the alteration in the plans thereof have been submitted to the Secretary of War and Chief of Engineers and approved by them as being adequate for the volume and weight of traffic that will pass over it," and to strike out section 2 in the following words:

SEC. 2. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act is hereby granted to the city of Little Falls, its successors and assigns, and any party to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure, or otherwise, is hereby authorized to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such party.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ALLEGHENY RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 10246) to authorize the commissioners of McKean County, Pa., or their successors in office, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River at a certain location where a highway known as State Highway Route No. 211 crosses said river at a location within the limits of the borough of Eldred or not distant more than one-half mile north of said borough of Eldred, McKean County, Pa., and I submit a report (No. 731) thereon.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was, on page 2, line 7, after the numerals "1906," to strike out the colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That such bridge shall not be constructed or commenced until the plans and specifications thereof shall have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers as being also adequate from the standpoint of the volume and weight of the traffic which will pass over it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 10169) granting the consent of Congress to the Gallia County Ohio River Bridge Co. and its successors and assigns to construct a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Gallipolis, Ohio, and I submit a report (No. 732) thereon.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 3, after the word "act," to strike out the following:

The construction of such bridge shall not be commenced, nor shall any alterations in the plans for the same be made either before or after its completion, until the plans and specifications for the bridge, or for alterations in the plans thereof, have been submitted to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers and approved by them as being adequate for the volume and weight of traffic that will pass over it.

On page 2, line 22, after the word "therefor," to strike out "may be had in any court of competent jurisdiction in such State" and insert "shall be the same as in the condemnation and expropriation of property in such State"; on page 5, line 1, after the words "Secretary of," to strike out "Agriculture" and insert "War"; in line 6, after the words "Sec-

retary of," to strike out "Agriculture" and insert "War"; and in line 12, after the words "Secretary of," to strike out "Agriculture" and insert "War."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ROCK RIVER BRIDGE, WIS.

Mr. BINGHAM. From the Committee of Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 9393) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at the city of Beloit, county of Rock, State of Wisconsin, and I submit a report (No. 729) thereon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PORTRAIT OF THE LATE PRESIDENT HARDING

Mr. FESS. From the Committee on the Library, I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 101) authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure an oil portrait of the late President Warren G. Harding, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, and it was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Joint Committee on the Library is hereby authorized to procure an oil portrait of the late President Warren G. Harding for the Executive Mansion, at a cost not to exceed \$2,500.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIMS OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HARRELD submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 178) authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2; and the House agree to the same.

J. W. HARRELD,
RALPH H. CAMERON,
JOHN B. KENDRICK,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

SCOTT LEAVITT,
W. H. SPROUL,
CARL HAYDEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the conference report which has just been read includes or excludes an item of \$346,000 concerning which there has been some controversy?

Mr. HARRELD. It did not deal with that at all. The only point in controversy was a limitation on the amount of fees which should be paid to attorneys. This is the Chippewa jurisdictional bill.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator if there is some bill in conference involving that question. I have had a number of communications in regard to it.

Mr. HARRELD. I do not recall the matter.

Mr. KING. Is there a bill pending which involves an item of \$346,000, to which the Indians are very much opposed?

Mr. HARRELD. Involving the Chippewa Indians?

Mr. KING. I am not sure.

Mr. HARRELD. The Senator refers to the Bratton bill, I think.

Mr. KING. I am not sure as to that. Letters came to me this morning mentioning the matter, and I have had no time to examine into the question.

Mr. HARRELD. I do not recall any such bill.

Mr. KING. If it had been included in this report, I did not want it to pass without comment.

The report was agreed to.

ADDRESS OF SENATOR SIMEON D. FESS

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an address made by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] at the Republican State Convention in Portland, Me., on April 6 of this year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the convention, the problems before the country to-day are largely due to conditions growing out of war.

Our part in the World War was under the direction of the Democratic Party, which was then in control and which by experience and attitude toward business integrity was not the best fitted to conduct such an undertaking in the most systematic or businesslike manner.

Such a convulsion as the World War at best would tax the best brain and leadership of the country, and even then many unfortunate mistakes would be made. These would be inevitable under such stress as provoked by the world's greatest convulsion. It is not important to dwell upon these mistakes. It is sufficient to recognize their commission and to correct them if possible.

The war brought its complications and peace its problems. The American people recognized both, and it was but natural for them to turn to the party of constructive business integrity for the work of readjustment.

When the Republican Party took full control in 1921 it found a public debt which, in 1914 was \$973,000,000, had gone to \$26,500,000,000, or an increase of more than 2,500 per cent. It found its annual interest charge ascend from \$40,000,000 to \$1,125,000,000. It found a tax burden which had been a fraction beyond a billion a year, all told, increased to five and one-half billion. It found its additional current obligations in the form of the unfunded or floating debt of three billions, carried by the banks at the expense of productive industry. Of the enormous funded loans, it had to meet the Victory loan of over four billion by May 20, 1923, which was due at that time, and in addition to the foregoing it had to meet the three-fourths of a billion dollars in war-savings stamps.

Government financing under the present Secretary of the Treasury commends itself as an unusual achievement. Aside from the current obligations which had to be met by heavy taxation, these Government obligations, in the form of the floating debt, war savings stamps, and Victory notes, presented the problem of meeting charges by 1923 of more than seven and one-half billion dollars. Three billion of this was the unfunded obligations which the Wilson administration had hoped might be cared for by revenue derived from war liquidations. To bridge it over the banks were asked to carry this enormous burden for the Government, which borrowed for from 3 to 6 months, with privilege of renewal if not paid. Of course, the payment could not be made, and the burden to the banks continued up to the time the present Secretary took charge of the finances.

The effect of this hand-to-mouth financial policy of financing was serious, with definite results. This item alone deprived industry of three billion cash, equivalent to at least \$7,000,000,000 of commercial credit. The immediate result was to starve industry for want of capital. The liquid assets which normally would flow to productive industry were frozen and banking became difficult. Interest rates scaled high, rediscount rates went higher, money became tight, industry was paralyzed, and widespread dislocations with dire consequences were ominous.

As enterprise slowed down when it did not entirely close, affecting all the basic industries, especially those of heavy investment of capital and large employment of labor, such as manufacturing, mining, and transportation, unemployment increased to an alarming extent, until at least 5,000,000 workers were without labor and general suffering reached much of our population.

The direct effect was displayed in an almost fatal decline of all values, and especially those in the security market. Even Liberty bonds, which should be the best security in the world, struck the low level of 84. This one item was the very best barometer of the unfortunate situation produced by this policy of Government financing, which called for definite and immediate relief.

The immediate problem of the Treasury therefore was to release at least this \$7,000,000,000 of commercial credit for industry now tied up by the Government. The Secretary sought the plan of transferring these obligations from the banks to the investment public. In case the public could and would absorb them in the purchase of short-term certificates, so maturing as to enable the Government to either pay or refund when due, the tied-up assets of the banks would be released, and then the banks could supply that amount of capital for industry.

He at first offered a block of one-half billion three-year certificates at 5½ per cent. Fortunately, the public immediately absorbed them by a large oversubscription. The same result was realized with the next half billion. He continued to offer and the public continued to oversubscribe, even at as low a rate as 4¼ per cent, until the entire floating or unfunded debt of three billion was cared for.

The results of this financing were speedy and definite. Banking became easier, interest rates declined, rediscount rates fell from 7½ in time to less than 5, capital began to flow into investment, industry at once began to revive, unemployment began to decline and in time entirely disappeared, general values appreciated, Government obligations (Liberty bonds) went to par, and the Nation's business integrity was again on a sound and substantial foundation.

This policy revealed a hitherto unknown power of our investment public, and its marked success induced the Secretary of the Treasury to proceed to convert the \$4,050,000,000 Victory notes falling due May 20, 1923, in a similar manner.

It was apparent that only a small portion of this vast obligation could be paid, and the amount was too great to be refunded in a lump sum without serious interruption to the industrial progress upon which the Nation had entered. His proposal therefore was to offer small blocks maturing at convenient periods, at the time fixed for income-tax payments, and as a further inducement to the public he allowed the acceptance of Victory notes in payment of taxes.

By October 31, 1923, he had successfully issued four series of certificates of indebtedness ranging from 4 to 4½ amounting to nearly one billion, to be exact, \$941,013,500. He had issued nine series of Treasury notes ranging from 4¼ to 5½, totaling \$4,050,432,000. The first two issues matured June 15 and September 15, 1924. The next three matured March 15, June 15, and December 15, 1925; the next two matured March 15 and September 15, 1926, and the last two March 15 and December 15, 1927.

This entire issue was completed by May 15, 1923, a few days before the maturity of the Victory loan. Instead of the Government facing obligations of \$7,500,000,000, due May 2, which it could not possibly pay, under the guidance of the Treasury all this vast sum was cared for by retiring a portion of it, funding that part known as the floating debt, and refunding the balance of it at a comparatively low rate of interest, resulting in a substantial saving for the Government, and at periods of maturity to avoid future confusion to the Treasury. This accomplished, operations to refund in similar manner the over three billion third Liberty loan due in 1928 are now proceeding, with about one-third of it already cared for. While figures are dry and financial discussions are generally uninteresting, there is no eloquence superior to the plain recital of the operations of the Treasury.

From 1921 to 1926 is time enough to estimate fairly well the wisdom of the policy. During that time the Government has not only balanced its Budget but it has reduced the public debt almost \$5,000,000,000, with a perpetual annual saving of \$225,000,000 of interest. This reduction could be made possible only by the policy of rigid economy of the administration led by the President and supported by Congress. During this period three separate measures of tax reduction were enacted, 1922, 1924, and 1926, totaling \$1,622,000,000, or an annual saving at the rate of over \$4,000,000 per day.

The prodigious operations of the Treasury, at once bewildering because of their dimensions and brilliant because of their success, are shown by the statement of the Secretary, for example, in his report of 1923:

"During the fiscal year of 1923 bonds, notes, and certificates of indebtedness amounting to \$7,057,189,860 were issued against cash receipts and bonds, notes, and certificates of indebtedness amounting to \$7,323,073,300 were discharged by payment."

The last report of the Treasury (1925) shows the wonderful position of the finances of the Government. The Secretary, commenting upon debt reduction, states:

"At the present rate of payment as provided in the sinking fund, the so-called domestic debt, representing money spent by America in the war, and amounting at the present time to \$8,712,700,000, will be discharged by 1944, which, including interest, will make total payments of \$12,754,700,000 to be made in the next 18½ years."

The outstanding significance of these operations is the tremendous financial reserve ability of the American people. These offerings were made to the public, and each of the more than dozen were oversubscribed. The last \$400,000,000 of the Victory notes was oversubscribed by almost a billion dollars.

Another fact of great importance was the ease with which the transactions were completed. It was so skillfully handled that business was not in the least interrupted, as is the usual result, while, on the contrary, scarcely any but those conversant with financial transactions even knew they were being made.

This ability is also shown in the security markets. Twenty-five years ago there were not over 4,400,000 shareholders in American corporations. To-day there are not less than 14,400,000. Last year 43,850,127 depositors held over \$23,000,000,000 in the savings banks of the United States. Total wages and salaries paid last year exceeded \$40,000,000,000—a mere suggestion of the reserve power of American labor. The movement toward popular ownership of utilities, both public and corporate, is one of the most significant of modern life and promises well for minimizing the perennial controversies between labor and capital.

Large credit must be given to the financial genius directing it. He knows the problem and has the solution. He has the complete confidence of the business world because of his economically

sound viewpoint. This enables him to mobilize the financial ability of the public which he has accomplished.

This ability, so wonderfully exemplified in his achievements, is the basis of the fiercest criticisms of a type of Democratic politicians in their charge that "big business" has taken control of the administration. The Government is a big business and never was administered in a bigger and better way, doing equal justice to all without regard to big or little interests and with a wider and more general distribution of wealth in which more people have a share than has yet been enjoyed in the history of civilization.

While the outstanding achievements of the Treasury so far as the public will judge it will always be the refunding operations and the reduction of the public debt, the greatest achievement was in the service rendered to relieve the people of the Nation from the general industrial depression with its wide-spread suffering. When the Treasury transferred to the investment public the obligations representing the floating debt, up to that time carried by the banks, which obligations had absorbed the banks' liquid assets and had inevitably starved industry, resulting in an army of unemployed, it relieved the banks and thereby released their frozen assets and made possible commercial credit of billions of dollars which at once flowed to productive industry and solved the problem of unemployment as well as Government credit.

This administration thus pointed the way for the industrial revival which in five years has placed the Nation in its strongest financial and industrial position. In no period of our history have the basic industries, save agriculture in those States where war liquidation has not yet been completed, been placed on a sounder basis. Capital is fully invested, labor is generally employed at higher wages and under better conditions with a better spirit in both labor and capital than at any previous period. There is also a closer relation between production and consumption thus minimizing the surplus problem of overproduction and avoiding the periodic depression of other years.

One of the important assets of sound government financing is the element of stability which replaces the haphazard method by a scientific method of business. This stability in industry relieves business as a mere venture by giving it a substantial character of more or less certainty. Under such circumstances capital has an easy flow, opening the way for our banking resources to seek profitable investment, and making possible the fullest employment of labor—steady and at a high level of wages.

To-day the transportation facilities of the country, a good barometer of business conditions, are taxed almost to their capacity. The traffic handled is the largest in volume, the most expeditious in movement, the safest in transit, the cheapest in transportation, and the most efficient in service in our history.

The mining and manufacturing situation is on a stable basis, with consumption keeping pace with production, which avoids the serious consequences of the surplus problem.

Investments, both governmental and industrial, are ranging on levels above par, and general transactions indicate confidence as well as stability in the investment market.

While the cost of living ranges high, it is due to an increasing scale of wages, which has risen higher than the cost of living. Compared with pre-war times the scale of wages has increased 237.9 per cent, while the cost of living has increased 177.9 per cent. There appears to be a better feeling between labor and capital growing out of a better understanding, and hence fewer strikes and less consequent loss and suffering from labor troubles.

Whatever else is desired from the administration of the Nation's affairs, nothing is more important than the prosperity of its people. When all the forces of normal production and consumption flow in normal channels, capital can find investment in productive industry by employing the labor of the country at a wage scale to maintain the proper standard of living of all classes. This latter must be assured in order to insure a consumption where the articles of production may be marketed.

The agriculturist is most interested in finding this market for that portion of his production not needed for his own consumption. The nonagricultural population is his chief consumer. The great industries employing millions of labor and paying out billions of wages absorb 95 per cent of the farmers' production.

The breaking down or even the crippling of this power is immediately reflected in the loss to the food producer, who will be denied the power to sell his surplus to secure the necessary funds to care for his annual expenses. The greatest service that can be rendered to the farmer is to supply this market at home.

Wherever legislation can economically assist in building up a consumptive power in the American people, such legislation will be reflected in the returns to the farmer; hence the importance of the American protective system. Wherever legislation can assist in securing a greater share of the price paid by the consumer by assuring better facilities for marketing, such legislation is warranted; hence the importance of cooperative marketing. But any proposal not based on the principles of sound economy should be avoided, as it only defers the day of reckoning. Economic ills must be met by economic

remedies. Any attempt to meet them by statutory enactment will end in disaster for all concerned. Here is the greatest danger confronting the industry of the farm.

Agriculture is not only basic but is the one all essential, without which the people could not subsist. Its future is assured if guided along sound lines free from politics. Its normal processes were interrupted by war; its speculative dealings almost uprooted its fundamental principles; evil results from such conditions and practices can not be cured by statutes. Future payments on land sales at inflated prices dependent upon the production from the farm is a problem to be met by sound economy, a problem that will not and can not yield to legislative remedies. If agriculture will be given a chance to readjust on economic lines, undisturbed by political considerations, it will soon be on a solid basis. Any makeshift legislation will only defer the day of reckoning with aggravated results.

As one aid to American industry our foreign trade has reached enormous proportions. Foreign business increased from six billions of dollars in 1924 to six billions eight hundred millions in 1925. This was a gain of eleven hundred million over 1923 and over five billion beyond pre-war days.

It is reported that our present total foreign holdings will amount to \$10,400,000,000, an increase for the year of over twelve hundred millions.

In passing, it is proper to say that the stability of Europe through her economic recovery is due to our leadership displayed in the Dawes commission plan, now in operation.

Judged by the character of the problem, aggravated by the disastrous dislocations, complicated by the vast national and international interests, strained by age-long and deep-seated national prejudices, the speedy adjustments of serious interruptions, the complete restoration of confidence and stability, the reorganization of the vast machinery of industry upon a sound economic basis, these achievements present a series of accomplishments that challenge the record to find an equal, since character rests upon a record rather than a prospectus, something accomplished rather than something promised. It is well to note other problems and their solution.

The foreign loans problem was another financial transaction that taxed the Nation's ability and patience. During and immediately after the war our country loaned to 20 foreign nations the prodigious sum of \$9,600,000,000, which, with interest at 4½ per cent to 1922, amounted to \$12,200,000,000. President Wilson urged these loans as necessary to win the war.

No payments, either of principal or interest, were made and no step taken to settle a basis upon which such payments would be made until after the inauguration of President Harding, when a debt commission was created and negotiations were begun. Britain's case was first taken up. She owed \$4,600,000,000. All talk of cancellation which had been vocal in Europe since the close of the war was waved aside. The principal must be paid in full. It was decided to give her 62 years in which to pay it.

A concession of a lower rate of interest was made by charging 3 per cent the first 10 years and 3½ per cent the 52 years remaining, totaling principal and interest \$11,100,000,000, the most stupendous transaction of history. This settlement was based upon 100 per cent payment of the principal, and about 78 per cent of interest, if we use 4½ per cent as a basis.

All other settlements up to date are substantially the same except Belgium and Italy. Belgium demanded, when the treaty of Versailles was signed, \$1,000,000,000 reparations, and the forced issue of 6,200,000,000 marks, during German occupation, redeemed. Belgium was induced by President Wilson, Lloyd George, and Clemenceau to reduce reparations to \$500,000,000 and entirely forego the redemption of the marks. As an inducement, she was to be exempted from the payment of interest on the prearmistice loans. Our loan was \$171,000,000. Upon that the settlement charges no interest. The postarmistice loan with interest at 4½ per cent to December 15, 1922, amounts to \$246,000,000. Upon this amount Belgium pays at same rates as Britain.

With Italy, the settlement required 100 per cent of the principal paid. But in interest, great concession was made. On an average for the 62 years, she pays only 1.1 per cent. The basis of this settlement took the financial situation into consideration. Italy is about one-half the size of France with almost as large a population. She has no colonies and received only 10 per cent of the spoils of war. Her agricultural facilities are not enough to supply her food necessities. Her raw materials are silk, water power, and labor. She has no coal to speak of, while we mine 42 per cent of all the coal mined in the world. She has no iron, while we have 54 per cent of the world's production. She has no cotton, while we have 69 per cent of the world's production. She has no copper, while we have 47 per cent of it. She has no petroleum, while we produce 62 per cent of the world's production. Her wealth is variously estimated at from \$22,000,000,000 to \$35,000,000,000.

Ours approaches \$400,000,000,000. Our annual income is estimated to be three times her total wealth. She suffers the heaviest taxation of any nation in Europe. She produces to the best of her ability and

cuts all expenses to the bone in order to balance her budget. She has reduced her army far below what other European nations have done.

This Nation as a creditor considered all these elements and definitely decided that its wisest course was to deal upon the basis of ability to pay. If a debtor is pushed beyond that limit, bankruptcy or repudiation will follow. It was neither wise nor just to either America or Italy to compel such alternative.

When within the next few weeks the administration will have completed these settlements, and so far as a nation can go in such matters as collecting debts from sovereign countries, will begin to receive annual payments upon the principal and such amounts of interest as have been agreed upon, the country's public debt will be reduced to the degree of annual payments upon principal and its annual charge of interest, which this year is \$833,000,000, can be reduced by the amount of interest paid. This achievement will not only secure to our own people relief, but it will go far toward greater stabilization of the European countries.

The war condition in Europe stimulated European immigration to such an extent that the administration was moved to meet that serious problem by further restrictive immigration legislation. We have now definitely adopted the wise course to close the gates except to such immigrants as will be desirable, and to all who will complicate our problems of government, our industrial organization, and our permanency of employment of labor.

To insure the continuous growth and expansion of our home market must ever be the purpose of our people. Our prime concern as a commercial power is to insure the fullest investment of capital in productive industry, employing American labor upon a scale of wages to maintain an American standard of living. To this end we have restored the protective tariff system, with the largest collection of customs dues in our history, the greatest volume of foreign trade, and a scale of domestic production never excelled.

The World War inevitably brought its international complications with our former associates as well as with our enemies. The list of more than 60 treaties between this and other governments make up the record of international adjustments. Outstanding in this program is the Washington conference in 1921, which in three months did more for the peace of the world than has been done in three centuries before.

It reduced the burdens of war taxation by limiting armament on the sea. It lessened the chances for war by ending naval rivalry by the 5-5-3 pact. It set up the machinery for peaceful settlement of future disputes on the Pacific through the four-power treaty. In addition to these results, it committed nine powers to the integrity of China, to the open-door policy in the Orient, to the cancellation of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, and to the return of Shantung to China.

This conference is pronounced by the best thought of Europe and America as the most far-reaching work for world peace yet achieved.

The continued disintegration of Europe, her deranged currencies, and prohibitive foreign exchanges forestalled all promise of economic recovery. The inevitable estrangement of Britain and France, driven farther apart by economic forces, led to our proposal for an international commission of survey, which after the lapse of a year finally resulted in the Dawes Commission. The plan recommended was accepted and is now in operation, with great promise of permanent stability.

The next normal step was the adherence to the World Court as the very best plan yet proposed to find a judicial process for settling international differences rather than resort to war.

Our people are sincerely anxious to reduce war to the minimum. They want their Government to lead in the further reduction of land armament. Without waiting for other nations, the United States proceeded at once after the war to reduce the American Army to the minimum. It invites Europe to take the same course, and had much to do with the preliminary steps into the Locarno conference. To-day no country is more anxious to see the Locarno spirit become regnant throughout Europe than the United States.

It would be difficult to produce a better record of leadership in international readjustments than has crowned the efforts of the United States since 1921. In all history no nation has ever reached such eminent position before the nations of the world.

Quite naturally the high position reached by this Republic, especially as a creditor, has caused more or less jealousy, if not bitterness, in some quarters among debtor countries. Even these concede to the United States the most potent force in civilization. At no time and in no place has business enterprise reached such dimensions. At no time nor at any place has wealth been so generally distributed. In no country at no time has home ownership been so much enjoyed by such a vast percentage of the people of a nation. At no time and in no place have the toilers of a nation emerged from the lowlands into such planes of independent influence and power as here in America.

At no time nor in any place has such equality of opportunity been exercised and enjoyed with such amazing popular results as here in America, where the employees of to-day become the employers of tomorrow, where the follower of one decade becomes the leader of the next, where preferment rests upon merit and solid worth with small regard for race, color, or previous condition. The crowning glory of our history is in the emphasis we place upon ability and service.

From such we recruit our leadership in all lines of usefulness. They come from the backwoods of Kentucky, from the towpaths on the canal, from the countryside in Vermont.

May I congratulate all America, and especially New England, on her leadership in the White House. The country has never had her course more clearly charted nor her pilot more steady handed than to-day. A mind unconfused by the nostrum vender, a courage undaunted by political threats, an integrity unsullied by partisan assaults, a character unaffected by personal innuendo—Calvin Coolidge is to-day entrenched in the hearts of the American public with a confidence never surpassed in the political history of America. As the leader of a great political party in the greatest country in history, measured by past accomplishments, present administration, and future possibilities, he is easily the most widely trusted, the most ardently supported, and the most powerful figure in the world to-day. Under his leadership the Nation is and will conserve its priceless privileges first announced in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

Under his guidance our fundamental institutions of government will be secure against any and all antigovernment agencies, without the loss of our fundamental liberties of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of religion.

With the stupendous progress of our material wealth the Nation is keeping pace in its intellectual and moral development and in those spiritual elements which must always lie at the foundation of real greatness.

Believing, as I do, that that party is the best that best serves the country, I congratulate this convention and the people of Maine, yes, the entire country, upon the achievement of the Republican Party, and especially its stupendous success since the war and at the present hour under the leadership of that New England product, this common-sense citizen, Calvin Coolidge.

COMMERCIAL POSSIBILITIES IN THE SOUTH

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I have an article written by Hon. R. Goodwyn Rhett, former mayor of Charleston, S. C., and a prominent citizen of my State, on "South Atlantic prospects." It is quite a historical article, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the News and Courier, Charleston, S. C., Thursday, April 29, 1926]

R. GOODWYN RHETT STRESSES SOUTH ATLANTIC PROSPECTS—COMMERCIAL POSSIBILITIES ARE DISCUSSED BY CHARLESTON BANKER AT CONVENTION OF THE FOREIGN TRADE COUNCIL

By R. Goodwyn Rhett, president People's First National Bank, Charleston

In order that you may acquire a clear understanding of the remarkable possibilities of the South Atlantic in national foreign trade I shall have to take you back somewhat into the history of this coast. From the story you will learn why our ports, which once enjoyed so commanding a position in America's foreign trade, became in a comparatively short time a negligible factor in it. You also will learn of the forces which brought this decline about and how finally and only recently the last of them has been overcome; and you will, too, appreciate the reason why there is now such rapidly spreading faith in the future of this territory in relation to the economic life of the United States. In doing this I shall generally speak of Charleston and her back country, because I am more familiar with her past and present, but her history in respect to foreign commerce is practically the history of all of her sister ports on the South Atlantic, save those of lower Florida, and with minor modifications is the history of the entire coast.

During the colonial period, when the thirteen States along the Atlantic coast which formed this Union still constituted the frontiers of America to the European settlers, no part of these frontiers was more attractive than this southern section of it, and no part of that section more prosperous than the coastal country of the Carolinas and Georgia.

CHARLESTON IN 1773

Josiah Quincy, of Boston, visiting Charleston in 1773, gives his impression of the city in the following entry upon his journal:

"This town makes a most beautiful appearance as you come up to it and in many respects a magnificent one. The numbers of shipping far surpassed all I have seen in Boston. I can only say in general that in grandeur, splendor, buildings, decoration, equipages, shipping, and, indeed, in almost everything it far surpasses all I have ever seen or ever expect to see in America."

DeBrahm, surveyor of the southern district of North America, says of it in the same year:

"The city of Charleston is in every respect the most eminent and by far the richest city in the southern district of North America. . . . The annual export of Carolina rice amounts to above 100,000 barrels of neat rice, worth in Carolina \$275,000, next to which is indigo,

whose exportation comprehends no less than 600,000 weight, worth in Carolina £150,000, and the whole annual exportation may be valued at £637,000."

A truly magnificent total from local products for that early period. For nearly three-quarters of a century that commerce grew and prospered, and you may well wonder why these notable achievements should have since dwindled to practically nothing. The story is not without interest and may be quickly told.

In the early days of the Colonies, negro slaves were introduced into almost all of them. Their importation soon grew to large proportions in the southern Colonies against vain protests made by most of these Colonies to Great Britain.

While the pecuniary advantages of slave labor in the cultivation of rice, indigo, cotton, and tobacco were recognized, the menace which the rapid increase of the Negro race began to assume was fully appreciated by many southern statesmen, and, it will be remembered, repeated efforts were made to check it.

Now, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia constituted the "Black Belt," where four-sevenths of the slaves were located. But not long after the formation of the Union the "Black Belt" began to shift southward and southward to the cotton fields—to the cultivation of which this labor was peculiarly well adapted.

During all of the first half of the nineteenth century the South continued to prosper, and a large part of her surplus income was invested in slave labor for the better and wider cultivation of her crops. Even as late as 1850 the census placed Georgia first among all the States in the Union in her personal property assessed for taxation, with Massachusetts second, South Carolina third, Alabama fourth, and New York fifth.

At that time the taxable value of the slaves in the South, who produced most of her cotton and tobacco, is reckoned at not less than \$1,000,000,000.

STEAM RAILROAD ERA

On the other hand, the economic story of the Eastern and Middle States is a very different one. Conditions there were not suitable for negro labor and much of it was in time transferred to the cotton States. In the early days of the Union the thoughts and energies of the North Atlantic States turned more and more to manufacture and shipping and also to finance. They invested their surplus incomes in buildings and machinery and their progress was equally rapid and in some respects more so. Their financial resources soon grew to large proportions, their per capita circulation about 1840 being something like \$9, to less than one-fourth of that amount in the South and West. Moreover, they early turned their attention to the problems of transportation as is admirably described by Prof. William E. Dodd, of the University of Chicago, in his "Expansion and Conflict," as follows:

"The masters of this region were reaching out for the commerce of the West through the Erie Canal, which made northern and central Ohio the hinterland of New York; through the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, which were aimed at western Virginia and the Ohio Valley. The shipping interests of New England and New York did the same for the South, whose millions of bales of cotton all went North or to Europe in eastern-made and eastern-owned vessels. And while these enterprising leaders sought to control the commerce of the country, they also knitted together their own towns and river valleys by canals and turnpikes."

Then it was that they laid the foundation of that complete control of the finances and the transportation of the country through which in later years the South Atlantic section was to suffer sorely and its ports to be cut off completely from foreign commerce, save in the products of its soil in the immediate vicinity of these ports and in the fertilizer materials necessary to grow its crops.

It was in 1828 that the locomotive appeared and the steam railway began to revolutionize land transportation. Men of vision here at once sensed the importance of promptly utilizing these new highways, and one of the earliest railroads constructed in the country ran from Charleston to the Savannah River opposite Augusta, 136 miles away, but there unfortunately it was halted for many years. Senator Robert Y. Hayne, who divided with Calhoun the political prestige of South Carolina at that time, conceived the idea of extending the road from Branchville to Columbia, both in this State, and thence through the Piedmont district of it through North Carolina into Tennessee and Kentucky, in order to connect up with that growing section and thus to establish a great trade artery between them and this port. As he himself expresses it:

WHERE PROFITS SHRANK

"The imports from Tennessee and Kentucky into South Carolina and Georgia amount to millions, but instead of their being paid for in foreign goods imported directly into Charleston and Savannah in exchange for our own cotton and rice we pay for them in gold or silver or in bills upon the North, thereby losing entirely the profit on the importation and thereby embarrass our merchants by the operation. Now, if we only had the means of transporting these goods by railway to the West everything would be changed. Not only would

we pay for western production consumed by the South in foreign goods received in exchange for our own produce, but we should be able to supply a large portion of the western country with all the goods now obtained by them from abroad, receiving in exchange their products to be distributed in southern ships through the world."

Unfortunately for Charleston, for South Carolina, and for the entire coast section this vision was never realized. Calhoun threw his influence for the construction of the road westward through Georgia. But while the people of North Carolina and Tennessee were clamoring for its construction to the Northwest, offering ample aid to that end, the people of Georgia never permitted a bridge to be built over the Savannah River at Augusta until 1853, over 20 years after the railroad reached its shores, and so Charleston never did acquire any trade route to and from the West.

In the meantime the East and Middle Atlantic States, as far south as Cape Hatteras, had been busy connecting up the interior of the country with their ports and their factories, which they were all the time expanding. A vast change now began to take place, the extent and consequences of which were not at all appreciated by the Southeast. This failure of the South Atlantic ports to establish any direct trade arteries into the Northwest accentuated the diverse interests of the two sections, and had the effect of concentrating the slaves into the southern section to a still greater degree and of confining the energies of its people more and more exclusively to agriculture.

Had this railway projected by Hayne been constructed at that time who can doubt that the cotton factories of the Piedmont sections of North and South Carolina would have been built many decades earlier than they were built and that the water powers of all that section would have been converted into use for manufacture of numerous kinds long before the Civil War; and who can say that this might not even have led to a peaceful solution of the vital problems which were driving the two sections further and further apart.

Now, it is not possible for you to understand why this section, so prosperous for a century and more—why ports on this coast, so alive with commerce up to 1860—have lagged behind the coast and ports to the north of us without some understanding of the consequences of the Civil War. And let me say that, despite the suffering and loss sustained by the South from that war, there is no regret here now over the result of it. No portion of the United States to-day is prouder of the Nation born of that struggle, of its achievements and its splendid ideals, and none is more ready and eager to contribute of its blood and treasure for the maintenance and perpetuation of these ideals than is this very section of it.

MAGNITUDE OF DISASTER

It is very difficult for those who were not in the South during the Civil War and for 10 years thereafter to realize the full extent of the disaster which overwhelmed her people. Not only were fields laid waste and thousands upon thousands of buildings destroyed, while the vast investments in slaves were wiped out of existence, but the political franchise, suddenly thrust upon these ignorant negroes without any preparation for it—without any understanding of its responsibilities—soon placed the government of the South in the hands of negro demagogues and of unscrupulous white carpetbaggers who invaded her territory solely for the purpose of plunder. During those 10 years the South was very naturally shunned by all save despoilers.

Capital studiously avoided her except for exploitation. Hundreds of thousands of her young men were driven into other parts of the country. But those who were left doggedly took up the task of extricating her from the hands of those who were literally strangling her of giving intelligent direction to the ignorant mass of negroes totally unaccustomed to self-control of rebuilding her industries and recultivating her fields; of educating her people, white and black; and out of her own shattered resources restoring her former prosperity.

The progress of the South since 1876, when the reconstruction era ended, has been almost incredible to those unfamiliar with the marvelous resources of the country and unacquainted with the indomitable spirit of her people who would not be denied their place in the Nation. Writers from all parts of the United States have told and retold that story in the daily press and magazines and I do not propose to repeat it here.

But in this wonderful progress Charleston and the other South Atlantic ports, until recently, have not shared to the extent which was naturally to be expected of them and the reason for this lies largely in the failure to realize Hayne's vision in 1832 and the consequences which naturally ensued.

HAMPERED BY VOTES

When the short railways of this section began to be grouped into systems, these systems were all found to run north and south along the coast—the Southern, the Atlantic Coast Line, and the Seaboard Air Line—while their control and management was dictated from the North. The East and West systems were all located above North Carolina. The rates to Atlantic ports north of Hatteras from all the country west of the Blue Ridge and Allegheny Mountains were practically the same, and to these rates the coastal systems above referred

to added their local rates into all the territory bordering the South Atlantic.

This rate structure completely shut out the ports on the South Atlantic from any participation in foreign commerce to and from the territory beyond their immediate environment and confined that commerce to the cotton, lumber, and naval stores at their doors for export, and to fertilizer materials to be used in their factories for import. Let me illustrate:

Cincinnati is 706 miles by rail from Charleston.

Cincinnati is 757 miles by rail from New York.

Cincinnati is 1,299 miles by rail from St. John, New Brunswick.

Cincinnati is 1,573 miles by rail from Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Before the World War the sixth-class rate from Cincinnati to these various ports was as follows:

To Charleston, 46 cents per 100 pounds.

To New York, 21½ cents per 100 pounds.

To St. John, New Brunswick, 21½ cents per 100 pounds.

To Halifax, Nova Scotia, 22½ cents per 100 pounds.

Here we find a rate of 46 cents per 100 pounds for a distance of 706 miles to one Atlantic port against a rate of 22½ cents per 100 pounds for a distance of 1,573 miles to another Atlantic port.

Now, the rail rates from the interior of the country to all the Pacific ports were and are practically the same, no matter what the distance; and in like manner the rail rates from the Middle West were and are practically alike to all the ports North of Hatteras even as far as Halifax—as we have seen in the above illustration—irrespective of distance, but the coast south of Hatteras and the ports located there were absolutely proscribed. For years these South Atlantic ports fought this outrageous discrimination without avail, until the World War brought it to the attention of the United States Government, when its War Department began shipping products from the Middle West to the port terminals at Charleston and would not countenance paying over twice the freight rate from Cincinnati to Charleston, a distance of 706 miles, as it was paying from Cincinnati to New York, a distance of 757 miles. And so it was that this coast for the first time was placed on a parity with the North Atlantic.

SOUTH ATLANTIC WINS

Subsequent to the war, when the railroads were turned back to their owners, an effort was made to restore the old injustice. All of the South Atlantic ports promptly joined in an effort to defeat that move. Each port contributed 25 of its leading citizens to a pilgrimage to the Middle West where the consequences to them in times of congestion at the Northern ports, and the general injustice to this coast, was explained in city after city—a splendid cooperative effort that bore fruit. The Interstate Commerce Commission refused the request and has continued to recognize the rights of the southeast Atlantic to an equal chance for its upbuilding. To-day we are enjoying the same rates to all these territories as our neighboring ports to the North and already the effect is marked upon this whole coastal section.

Several years ago a conference of the steamship owners and operators along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of America was held for the purpose of agreeing upon ocean rates to Europe. Under the domination of the North Atlantic steamship companies, acquiesced in by the Shipping Board, a differential of 7½ cents for 100 pounds was placed against this coast, and 15 cents per 100 pounds against the Gulf coast. This, of course, made shipments from the interior via the South Atlantic and Gulf ports to Europe impracticable. In reply to vigorous protests, the difference in distance was cited as the justification, but it soon became apparent that this plea was untenable because the difference between the distance from Boston to Liverpool and the distance from Baltimore to Liverpool (430 miles), both enjoying the same rates, was very much greater than the difference between the distance from Baltimore to Liverpool and the distance from Charleston to Liverpool (135 miles), where 7½ cents were added to the ocean rate.

Moreover, all the North Atlantic ports were given equal rates to all portions of Europe, including the Mediterranean, irrespective of the difference in distances, and New York had the same rates to Havana as Savannah, although the distance in the latter case was less than one-half the distance in the former case. Now that injustice has also been rectified and the South Atlantic ports for the first time in a half century have a real opportunity of taking their proper place in the foreign commerce of the country. The increase in commerce through these ports in the last two years clearly forecasts the results which must follow in larger and larger measure; e. g., Charleston's foreign trade jumped from \$19,500,000 in 1922 to \$43,500,000 in 1925, and it is the same story with Savannah, Jacksonville, Wilmington, and Brunswick. In fact, the increase is even greater in some of them.

DEEP WATER AT CHARLESTON

In recent years the harbors along this coast have been deepened to meet the deepening drafts of vessels, and you will find that Charleston is now in a position to admit the largest and deepest draft freight vessels constructed and all but the largest of passenger liners; and

the other ports to the north and south of her are practically similarly situated.

In the matter of terminals, each port along this coast has made extraordinary efforts to furnish itself with the very best of facilities. A few years ago Charleston bought from the railways a large portion of her own water front and erected city terminals there with all modern appliances for handling materials economically and rapidly. Moreover, the Government during the World War erected port terminals on the Cooper River with a storage capacity of 1,500,000 square feet and a frontage of half a mile. The terminal warehouses are divided into compartments with fireproof walls and equipped with sprinklers throughout, giving the lowest of insurance rates. The railroads all turn into the port terminals before they reach the congested city district. The connection between the cars and the ships is made without delay, while the delivery from the one to the other is handled at an unusually small cost.

A southern banker told me several weeks ago that he had heard one of the leading business men of New York in an address before one of her commercial bodies predict that the competition which that port was going to feel most in the next two decades would come from the South Atlantic. You can now understand the reason why. And this opening up of new avenues of foreign trade through this coast is going to constitute an important factor in placing many of our industries in a better position to meet, as well as relieve congestion in foreign competition in foreign fields, northern ports at certain periods.

Santee Canal Project

There are many ports of the world where branches of factories on this coast would be enabled to deliver merchandise much cheaper than they can do at present. In fact, the opportunities in the field of industry in this section have become as inviting as those in foreign trade. The country in the vicinities of these ports, stretching back to the mountains, presents a most attractive field for the establishment of innumerable industries. The climate is mild and salubrious, the mortality rate being among the lowest in the whole United States. The cost of living is cheap in comparison with the more congested sections of the country. The opportunity for outdoor recreation is open all the year round, while improved roads now everywhere to be found in this territory add much to that opportunity. They also give to industry the facilities which in this day they must have to live and prosper.

Already the textile mill industry is centering in the Carolinas and north Georgia, and not altogether because of the proximity of the cotton field, for many of these mills bring in their cotton from fields hundreds of miles away, but because of the cheap water power, of the salubrious climate—winter and summer—and of the greater comforts and pleasures which may be secured by employees at a small cost. Living being cheaper, healthier, and more accessible to recreation, labor is content with less compensation because that compensation procures so much more for them.

Already over 50 per cent of the electrical energy produced in the South is derived from water-driven generators, and some of the largest water powers have yet to be developed and put into operation, such as the great water power at Muscle Shoals, now awaiting a lessee.

Several years ago an investigation was instituted into the practicability of securing a large water power at the very doors of Charleston. The Foundation Co., of New York, has recently reported a project for the development of a water power from the Santee River second only to that of Muscle Shoals, and at a cost far below the average cost of the water powers of the country, and the Government has just approved the plans necessary for its installation, i. e., impounding the waters of that river into a lake covering some 50,000 acres of land—principally swamps, I am glad to say.

Who would have dreamed a few years ago that the waters of the Santee could be impounded with a 75-foot fall and give us a great water power 20 miles from the port terminals on Cooper River? And yet that development is now, we understand, about to take place.

As I said in opening this address, I am speaking almost exclusively of Charleston and South Carolina because I am more familiar with that city and State, but the other cities on the South Atlantic have a similar story to tell both with respect to their ports and their magnificent back country. Each in its own way has been recently preparing for the tide of commerce and industry which is now rising and daily gathering strength and each is confidently facing the future.

SERVICES BY WATER

Already regular steamer services have been established from these ports to Europe, the West Indies, South America, the Pacific coast, and the Far East. It is only by regular sailings upon which exporters and importers can depend that commerce can grow to any proportions, and these are now being established to an ever-widening foreign field. It is always an uphill task to change the trend of traffic. No shipper wants to make a move from a service he has found reliable, even at the saving of some expense, to one upon the permanency of which any doubts are cast, and so it will take time and much advertising to establish complete confidence in these services, most of which are only of recent origin;

but the progress already made has been phenomenal and the final outcome can not be doubted.

It is most opportune that this convention, composed of the leaders of industry from all sections of these United States, seeking closer and more economic connection with foreign markets, should visit Charleston at this juncture, so that its members may see for themselves the wonderful opportunities which are opened up to them in this the last frontier in America; for by the Civil War, the era of negro domination and the rate of discrimination above described, this coast, which a century and a half ago, constituted one of the most inviting and progressive of the earliest frontiers in America, has for a half a century been almost obliterated from the view of leaders of industry as a land of opportunity. With the breaking down of these barriers it is again thrown open to American enterprise, and never was there a more inviting field to that enterprise in its westward march of progress to the Pacific than is now opened up on this return march to the South Atlantic.

For many years the climate and attractions of Florida were advertised with meager results. In spite of the magnificent hotels erected there to attract the winter tourists and the splendid trains put in the service, the progress was slow in comparison with Lower California. At last the attention of the country was caught and for three years the trek to Florida has surpassed that which followed the gold discoveries in California.

The boom in that State is said to be passing, but, however that may be, the most remarkable development in the history of the country has taken place there and the eyes of America have not only been opened to the glories of that State but to those of all this coastal section, and to the marvelous opportunities that lie here for both industry and commerce. The march of progress for half a century after the Civil War was everywhere heralded to be westward. It has now definitely turned back to the southeast—"the last of American frontiers"—and to-day the land of highest promise in all its vast and rich territory.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6559) for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERNALD. Mr. President, I desire to say that for two weeks I have been giving away on every proposition to every Senator who might have anything to present. I feel that the time has now come for action on the public buildings bill. Beginning to-morrow at noon I shall endeavor to keep the bill before the Senate until final action is taken on it one way or another.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, May 1, 1926, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 29), 1926

APPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY

GENERAL OFFICER

Brig. Gen. John Joseph Garrity, Illinois National Guard, to be brigadier general, Reserve, from April 24, 1926.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

CHAPLAINS

Rev. James Hugh O'Neill, of Montana, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant, with rank from April 24, 1926.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

SIGNAL CORPS

First Lieut. William James Daw, Field Artillery, with rank from July 1, 1920.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE MAJOR

Capt. Richard LeRoy Cave, Finance Department, from April 22, 1926.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 30 (legislative day of April 29), 1926

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

TO BE SECRETARY

Willys R. Peck.
Paul R. Josselyn.
Eugene H. Dooman.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

TO BE COMMANDER

John F. McClain.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Kenneth C. Hawkins. Frank H. Conant, 2d.
Tighman H. Bunch, jr. Samuel Gregory.
Stanley J. Michael.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Omer A. Kneeland. George D. Cooper.
John G. Mercer. Daniel B. Candler, jr.

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT PAYMASTER

Edwin A. Eddiegorde.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Vennie M. Jones, Lavonia.

MINNESOTA

G. Harriet Payne, Bertha.

NEW JERSEY

Eva H. Ketcham, Belvidere.
John Boyd, Greystone Park.
Peter A. Greiner, jr., Woodbridge.

WEST VIRGINIA

Jesse H. Petty, Gary.
Justus E. McCaskey, Paden City.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, April 30, 1926

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord and Master, do Thou give us grace and courage that our lives may approach Thine in charity and unselfishness. Lift us all to the high level where we may make new discoveries of Thy wisdom and truth. We would draw near to Thee and ask for that guidance that would inspire us with courage, patience, and dignity to meet the duties which are ours. Do Thou quicken every impulse of our breasts, that in all our intercourse with our fellows we may hallow Thy name and so fulfill the law of the prophets. Help us to heed these convictions and ideals until we come unto the stature of Him who came that we might have the more abundant life. In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special order to-day the House, as in Committee of the Whole, may consider unobjected bills on the Private Calendar, beginning at the point where we left off the last day on which the Private Calendar was considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that to-day, after the conclusion of the special order adopted by the House, it shall be in order to consider bills on the Private Calendar unobjected to in the House, as in Committee of the Whole, beginning at the star on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I trust that that will be agreeable to all gentlemen. I understand that we are to have a day when contested bills will be considered. It strikes me that it will be all right to go along with the unobjected bills to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, on account of important engagements by a number of the Members of the House to-morrow I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on next Monday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] for one hour.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, there has been pending before Congress for many years a group of private claims called the French spoliation claims. They are pending in one branch of Congress now, and sooner or later